

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

DE GRUYTER

*Franco Montanari,
Lara Pagani (Eds.)*

FROM SCHOLARS TO SCHOLIA

CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY
OF ANCIENT GREEK SCHOLARSHIP



TRENDS IN CLASSICS

From Scholars to Scholia

Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes

Edited by
Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos

Scientific Committee

Alberto Bernabé · Margarethe Billerbeck · Claude Calame
Philip R. Hardie · Stephen J. Harrison · Stephen Hinds
Richard Hunter · Christina Kraus · Giuseppe Mastromarco
Gregory Nagy · Theodore D. Papanghelis · Giusto Picone
Kurt Raaflaub · Bernhard Zimmermann

Volume 9

De Gruyter

From Scholars to Scholia

Chapters in the History
of Ancient Greek Scholarship

Edited by
Franco Montanari
Lara Pagani

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-025162-3
e-ISBN 978-3-11-025163-0
ISSN 1868-4785

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

From scholars to scholia : chapters in the history of ancient Greek scholarship
/ edited by Franco Montanari and Lara Pagani.

p. cm. -- (Trends in classics. Supplementary volumes ; v. 9)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-025162-3 (acid-free paper)

1. Greek philology--History. 2. Scholia. 3. Greek literature--Criticism,
Textual. I. Montanari, Franco. II. Pagani, Lara.

PA53.F76 2011

480--dc22

2010050354

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Typesetting: Michael Peschke, Berlin

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Preface	vii
Franco Montanari Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian <i>Ekdosis</i> and Papyri	1
Lara Pagani Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language	17
Paola Ascheri The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in <i>POxy.</i> 3710	65
Silvia Consonni Observations on Περί ἐπιρρημάτων by Apollonius Dyscolus	87
Fausto Montana The Making of Greek Scholiastic <i>Corpora</i>	105
Bibliography	163
General index	191
List of contributors	207

Preface

The field of research that encompasses philology, erudition and grammar in the ancient Greek world has, at least since the mid XXth century, aroused increasing interest. This vast sector covers a broad spectrum of disciplines that include the diversified production that goes by the label of “ancient scholarsip”, which flourished on account of the need to conserve, interpret and study the works of the great authors of the past: textual criticism and exegesis on the one hand (i.e. text conservation and interpretation in the strict sense) and the study of linguistic phenomena on the other (vocabulary, grammar, rhetoric). The chronological range involved is very extensive: for if this type of literature reached its *akme* between the IIIrd century B.C. and the Ist century A.D., the earlier stages have been shown to be far from inconsiderable – with examples of erudite activity in the classical age – while the later phases, right up to the Byzantine era, are equally noteworthy. Moreover, the themes now regarded as falling within the sphere of ancient scholarship represent a rather wide variety of subjects, extending to such areas as biography, rhetoric, “literary criticism”, philosophy, the history of the book¹. In the lively panorama of research in this sector, which over the decades has seen the flowering of in-depth studies, collections of materials, as well as works giving an overview of the main aspects, we will limit ourselves to mentioning only, among the innumerable possible examples, the important international conference held in Thessaloniki in December 2008 (*Language, Text, Literature. Archetypes, Concepts, and Contents of Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. 2nd Trends in Classics* international conference), in which a wealth of issues concerning ancient scholarship were addressed, and where the conviction of an indissoluble unity between ‘linguistic description’ and ‘interpretation of linguistic contents in literary contexts’² played a major role.

The present work follows along the line of study outlined above. It springs in part from the colloquium entitled *La parola del poeta e la parola dell'interprete. Eruditi e grammatici nella cultura greca antica*, organized by

1 This type of perspective was inaugurated, explicitly, in a session of the Entretiens Hardt specifically devoted to the topic: Montanari 1994.

2 See the forthcoming proceedings: Matthaios/Montanari/Rengakos 2010.

Franco Montanari (from the 2nd to the 5th of September 2008) at the Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité Classique, in Vandoeuvres (Geneva). Four of the papers read during the colloquium (namely the papers by Elena Esposito, Serena Perrone, Antonietta Porro and Marco Stroppa) dealt with papyrological topics, and were published in the volume *Fragments of the Past. Ancient Scholarship and Greek Papyri* (*Trends in Classics* 2009, 1.2), edited by Franco Montanari and Serena Perrone. Some of the others (specifically, those by Fausto Montana and Lara Pagani) will now appear in the present collection, which also includes a contribution by Franco Montanari dedicated to further enquiry into a specific portion of the vast theme he considered in the Geneva seminar (*La filologia alessandrina da Zenodoto a Didimo*), and two other studies contributed by “outsiders” not present at the Geneva seminar (those by Paola Ascheri and Silvia Consonni). In effect this collection, by its very nature and genesis, is the outcome of close collaboration and constant exchange of ideas among the different research groups to which the scholars who took part in the 2008 seminar belong. Not only was there intense and constructive debate during the colloquium itself (the main results of which enrich the two contributions from the 2008 event which are published here), but the common reflection and discussion continued during the subsequent period, leading to new studies (those by Ascheri and Consonni testify to this creative drive).

The article by Franco Montanari (*Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian Ekdosis and Papyri*) focuses on the problem of the concrete form of the *ekdosis* of a literary work as carried out by the Alexandrian philologists, exploring what it meant to create an *ekdosis* and what procedures were materially involved in its execution. The question is discussed by starting out from an examination of papyri containing literary works and presenting interventions in the form of corrections of material errors; emphasis is placed above all on *POxy.* 2404 + *PLaur.* inv. III/278 (end IInd-beginning IIIrd century A.D.), which contains part of Aeschines' oration *Against Ctesiphon*. What is thereby highlighted is the central importance of the relation between the library artefact and the text as an object of editing, that is to say, between on the one hand the craftsman's practices, aimed at correcting, in a *copy*, that which was held to be wrong (often by means of a comparison with the antigraph or with other copies), and on the other hand, the rise of a philological practice seeking to emend the *text* of a work, in which case it was the text itself that was held to be unsatisfactory due to errors that had crept in over time and had been handed down through tradition. Finally, the framework thus reconstructed allows reflection on the nature of the readings attributed to the Alexandrian grammarians (conjectures *ope*

ingenii, variants from a documentary source or a mixture of both procedures).

The study by Lara Pagani (*Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language*) can be set in the context of the debate on the germinal stages of linguistic theory in the ancient Greek world. In particular, the paper offers a critical review of the research that developed, from the XIXth century onwards, around the role assumed to have been played by the first Hellenistic philologists in the birth of technical grammar. Antithetical positions have been taken in this regard, on the one hand minimizing the linguistic observations documented for the Alexandrian erudites and looking on these as the occasional by-product of their studies on poetry, or, on the contrary, emphasising their knowledge of a structured grammatical system. The approach that best seems to capture the philologists' first steps towards linguistics is one that interprets philology and grammar not as separate or conflicting fields, but rather as linked by a close-meshed interaction: such a viewpoint makes it possible to ensure due recognition of the value of the erudites' "grammatical" interventions, yet without refuting their original motivation, which was prompted by their concern for criticism and text exegesis.

The contribution by Paola Ascheri (*The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in POxy. 3710*) focuses on the ancient theory that the Romans were of Greek descent, examining traces of such a belief found in two kinds of text that have received relatively little attention from this perspective: the Homeric scholia and a passage from an important commentary on book XX of the *Odyssey*, transmitted in *POxy. 3710* (IInd century A.D.). This evidence testifies partly to an attempt at identifying a Homeric antecedent for Roman customs, whereby it was sought to demonstrate that the Romans were actually of Greek origin and that their language, Latin, derived from Greek, but it also points to an attempt in the inverse direction: the commentary on *POxy. 3710* reveals the influence of theories that tried to show the Roman origins of Homer through the search for analogies between the Homeric and the Roman world. These opposing concepts are seen as the two faces of one and the same endeavour: namely the effort by Augustan propaganda to create a "global" and unitary vision of the Graeco-Roman world, as a means of bringing about a state of mind whereby the Greeks would accept the Roman conquerors and yet, at the same time, the Romans would feel proud to have ancient Greek origins.

The article by Silvia Consonni (*Observations on Περί ἐπιρρημάτων by Apollonius Dyscolus*) explores the etymology of the Greek term

ἐπίρρημα (“adverb”) in the monographic study of Apollonius Dyscolus dedicated to this part of speech. Its name, according to Apollonius, indicates the anteposition (ἐπί) of the adverb to the verb (ῥῆμα), and this was in fact the only syntactic relation he admitted as legitimate between two grammatical elements. Postposition of the adverb to the verb, which did exist in the general practice of language, was in his view an alteration of the grammatical structure. The same situation is found in the Apollonian explanation of the meaning of the adjective ἐπιταγματικός applied to the pronoun αὐτός, which is examined in parallel with the question of the adverb position. Consonni’s study allows some specific comments (in the *Appendix*) on ancient grammatical terminology in the principal modern dictionaries.

The collection closes with the investigation conducted by Fausto Montana into the origin of the scholiographic corpora to the ancient Greek authors (*The Making of Greek Scholiastic Corpora*), a highly important point and the subject of extensive debate in the history of studies in this field. The hypothesis of the late antique origin of scholiography has been widely embraced and has exerted considerable influence on scholars of classical antiquity, to the point of being hailed as a definite and certain acquisition. Montana’s research presents an overview and a discussion of the traditional arguments: the comparison with the biblical *catenae*, the parallel with Latin scholiography where the adverb *aliter* (ἄλλως in Greek) can be seen as a verbal alert signalling the application of the compilative procedure; a careful and wide-ranging examination of books with broad margins dating from late antiquity and the proto-Byzantine age, densely annotated in the margins (on this point, it is not possible to document that the annotators did resort to compilation from different exegetic sources, nor to confirm that this procedure was used with a methodical and systematic criterion); the palaeographic evidence, with the question of the small-sized handwriting as a prerequisite in order to have marginal annotation and the problem of the subscriptions; the persistence of separate commentaries on codex in late antiquity. The conclusion reached, which must necessarily be cautionary, is that in the absence of direct evidence, the existence of scholiography cannot be postulated as a need or an obvious historical fact for the era prior to the IXth century.

This collection thus presents several in-depth analyses on perspectives of ancient scholarship, starting out from an enquiry into disparate aspects of the work of philologists in the Hellenistic and imperial age, such as the *ekdosis* of literary texts, reflections on language and grammatical theorization, the re-utilization in the Roman world, for the purposes of propaganda, of the results of erudite activity. These

considerations then lead to reflection on the scholiographic *corpora* by means of which the greater part of ancient scholarship, through numerous stages of re-elaboration and abbreviation, has been handed down to us: *from scholars to scholia*.

Franco Montanari
Lara Pagani

Genoa, September 2010

Correcting a Copy, Editing a Text. Alexandrian *Ekdosis* and Papyri

Franco Montanari

In the period from Zenodotus to Aristarchus, *ekdosis* confirmed its place within ancient culture as a typical product of Alexandrian philologists along with *hypomnema*, *syngramma*, and the collection of *lexeis* and other exegetical-erudite products. How the *ekdosis* of a literary work was effectively carried out, what form it took and the way in which it was prepared in actual practice by the grammarian have for some time been the object of debate. As we shall see, the question also has effects on the reconstruction and assessment of the method and results of philological activity, of which *ekdosis* is a part. I have over the last few years analysed these questions¹, emphasising the importance of the relationship between the library artefact on one hand and the text as an object of editing, with its various paratextual elements such as annotations and *semeia*, on the other hand². We must take into account and give the right prominence to what we know regarding the creation of new copies of texts (in the *scriptoria* by professional scribes or privately by individuals) along with insights that can be gleaned from surviving examples.

Significant problems for instance have arisen as to understanding the method of work adopted by Zenodotus, the first of the major Alexandrian philologists. According to Rudolf Pfeiffer, «It is not improbable that Zenodotus, examining manuscripts in the library, selected *one* text of Homer, which seemed to him to be superior to any other one, as his main guide; its deficiencies he may have corrected from better readings in other manuscripts as well as by his own conjectures. Διόρθωσις can be the term for either kind of correction. It is hard to imagine any other way»³. K. Nickau, the author of important works on Zenodotus, states:

English translation by Justin Rainey.

1 Montanari 1998; 2002; 2004; 2009b and 2009c, with extensive bibliography.

2 The question is discussed by Jacob 1999, as part of a wider overview of the development of philology (see on the Alexandrians in particular p. 80).

3 Pfeiffer 1968, 110.

«Dann ist zu fragen, ob Z(enodotos) nicht einen durch Recensio ermittelten Homertext zugrundelegte (der jedoch nicht seinen Vorstellungen von der genuinen Form der Epen entsprach), diesen mit Obeloi versah und zu ihm Textvorschläge sowie deren Begründung mitteilte. Z(enodotos) selbst wie auch seine Hörer machten sich entsprechenden Notizen, die, wären sie von Z(enodotos) schriftlich veröffentlicht worden, ‘Hypomnemata’ hätten heißen können. Aber die Zeit der schriftlich publizierten Homer-Kommentare begann erst mit Aristarchos. So würden sich auch die späteren Unsicherheiten in der Berichterstattung über Z(enodotos)s Ausgabe erklären»⁴.

The fundamental position, supported by the two eminent scholars⁵, excludes the possibility that the *ekdosis* of Zenodotus consisted in a new copy bearing the continuous text wanted by the grammarian i.e. the whole text completely re-written by him (or for him), with his readings incorporated, with the *obeloi* in the margins indicating the athetesis, without the verses which in his opinion had to be omitted. As Pfeiffer says, it is hard to imagine another way of working that did not consist in carrying out corrections on an already existing copy, appropriately chosen from those available and used as the basic text on which the grammarian would over time make changes and add annotations as part of his studies and the work of *diorthosis*. I share this position and regard it as the one on which to base further discussions. Owing to the size of the documentation and knowledge available, these discussions will focus specifically on the Homeric text. However, we can assume a substantially similar approach also for other authors subject to philological analysis by the Alexandrian grammarians.

A similar method of producing the *ekdosis* was utilised by Zenodotus and continued to be used by later grammarians. A philologist chose, according to his own preferences, an exemplar that he considered suitable as a basis for his work. When he rejected the text, he noted in the place in question the preferred reading in the free spaces or between the lines. His own text resulted from the original text chosen together with the changes suggested and contained in the paratext created. Next to the verses were placed the appropriate *semeia*: Zenodotus began just with an *obelos* for his proposal of athetesis, with the system subsequently becoming considerably richer and more differentiated. Doubts remain as to what extent the working copy may have contained also explanatory annotations. Such annotations, however, must have been present⁶ and,

4 Nickau 1972, 30–31.

5 See also *infra*, n. 38 for the position of H. van Thiel in this regard.

6 For a discussion of papyrus *marginalia*, see McNamee 2007.

in this respect, a development may have taken place (as proposed by Nickau), leading eventually to the separate *hypomnema*. We can imagine this as a product of years of study that led to over time a series of interventions to the same copy. This copy, bearing the traces of the work of *diorthosis*, resulted materially in the philologist's own *ekdosis* of Homer. This was his own personal copy, it bore his name for purposes of identification and contained the fruit of his work and insights; *ekdosis* in that it was *ekdotheisa*, i.e. available for consultation by scholars, poets and intellectuals.

Until the writing of commentaries became standard practice, with larger spaces available for illustrating the arguments proposed and the materials used, the working copy containing in the margins the *semeia*, the divergent readings along with any brief notes was the key source for knowing the philologist's opinion of the text he had worked on. This copy could also be accompanied by other types of works, such as essays on a particular subject, lexicographic collections or even notes from scholar/school *milieu*, transmitted orally or by memory. This was probably the case for Zenodotus, Aristophanes and the pre-Aristarchean grammarians in general, with the inevitable degrees of uncertainty well-known to those working in this field. With Aristarchus, the practice certainly remained of producing an *ekdosis* made up by the working copy and its paratextual surrounds. However, this *ekdosis* often came with the *hypomnema*, which became the ideal means with which the philologist was able to develop his arguments on a quantity and variety of philological-exegetical themes.

I find it difficult to raise objections to the view that the production of a philological *ekdosis* was based on working methods and practices that were certainly by no means new or unusual in an intellectual environment that had been used to be a "book civilisation" for at least two centuries. There is little doubt (and I have supported this position for some time) that the philological work of the Alexandrian grammarians, starting from the first generation, represented something new in cultural history and marked significant intellectual progress. The reality of this revolution, I believe, becomes more evident and tangible if we highlight the precedents and foundations that initiated and nurtured developments as well as uses that were new in methodology and above all in scope.

It is an accepted fact that examples of literary works were normally re-read and corrected thanks to additional further comparison with the antigraph, at times even on the basis of a collation with other copies. Naturally, we are interested in the most ancient evidence. However, we are to an extent conditioned by the fact that the most ancient Greek papyri that we are aware of, from the second half of the IVth century

B.C., are extremely limited in number. One of these, possibly the oldest, is the well-known fragment of the *Persians* of Timotheus, *PBerol.* inv. 9875. At col. IV, l. 133, after having written βορειαιραισον|ται, the scribe inserted a δ *supra lineam* in order to restore the correct reading βορέα διαραισον|ται. At col. V, l. 196, after having written πλουτουοδε, the scribe inserted an ι *supra lineam* to restore the correct reading πλούτου οί δέ. These two corrections (διορθώσεις) were made either *in scribendo* or following a rereading of the text. In the renowned *Derveni Papyrus*, dated around the end of the IVth century B.C., at col. XXI, l. 11 a first hand corrects]ρμοναδε by inserting an ι *supra lineam* to restore the correct A]ρμονία δέ, whilst at col. VI, l. 5 the omission of a letter in τοιδε (instead of τοῖς δέ) at the end of the line is not corrected. Such examples suggest that the corrections were not the product of a systematic analysis, but were made by the scribe, probably *in scribendo*, if he should notice a mistake⁷. These corrections of material errors, though not classifiable as a significantly evident phenomenon, certainly represent the most ancient, tangible and visible evidence of a concern for the creation of a correct text and can be placed just before or at the same time as Zenodotus (330 ca.-260 ca.).

From the IIIrd century B.C. comes the Milan papyrus with epigrams by Posidippus, *PUniv.Milan.* 309, which represents important evidence not only because of the ancient epoch to which it belongs, but also in view of the quantity of corrections and annotations the text presents. The majority of the corrections were made by the same scribe, but subsequently two other hands intervened with further emendations and the differences in approach should be recognised. «Il medesimo scriba è responsabile della maggioranza delle correzioni ... Gli interventi sono tutti assai limitati (in genere coinvolgono una sola lettera e mai più di tre) e sono tutti diretti ad emendare banali errori di stesura, cioè fraintendimenti, sostituzioni accidentali ed omissioni. La maggior parte di essi è stata manifestamente eseguita *in scribendo*; e tutti quanti sono stati compiuti con studiata accuratezza ... infatti, se gli errori emendati fossero apparsi evidenti, avrebbero dato immediatamente l'impressione che il testo fosse scritto senza la necessaria precisione ed avrebbero svilito il lavoro di chi lo aveva scritto. Dopo quella del copista, altre due mani hanno inserito emendamenti nel rotolo, operando entrambe in pochi punti e senza avere la precauzione di occultare i loro interventi, come invece cercava di fare il copista ... Si potrebbe pensare che questa [*scil.* la seconda mano, m. 2] sia la mano di un revisore del centro di copia in

7 Turner/Parsons 1987, 92; text in Kouremenos/Parássoglou/Tsantsanoglou 2006.

cui fu realizzato il rotolo. L'ipotesi non è del tutto esclusa; ma non è nemmeno sostenuta da indicazioni certe. Anzi, il fatto che le correzioni di m. 2 siano tutte concentrate in due sole colonne consecutive, induce a ritenere che chi le apportò fosse un lettore particolarmente interessato a quella sezione dello scritto, più che un revisore obbligato a controllare tutto il rotolo. Fu sicuramente un lettore la terza persona che intervenne sul testo [*scil.* m. 3] ... i suoi interventi sono concentrati tutti nella col. XI. Lì egli segnalò una variante di lettura per la l. 30, annotandola nel margine superiore»⁸. Let us take one example. At col. XI, l. 30 we can read κεντρακαιεξω[; in the upper margin, one of the two hands working on the text after the original scribe has written καικεντρα (the last three letters are not visible in the photograph but can be seen in the original document)⁹. It is extremely likely that this is a correction or a variant, probably for the κέντρα καί of the text, an inversion – καὶ κέντρα – is proposed, but it is not clear owing also to the fact that the rest of the verse has not been preserved¹⁰.

The papyrus findings of the IInd and IIIrd centuries of our era are sizeable and the evidence of the period provides us with valuable and abundant documentation. The following significant examples will suffice for our purposes, although these could be easily added to.

POxy. 2161, of the IInd century A.D., contains Aeschylus' *Diktyoulkoi*. The scribe has occasionally corrected some of his own errors. For

8 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, 15: «The same scribe is responsible for most of the corrections ... Interventions are extremely limited (in general amounting to one and never more than three letters) and are all aimed at correcting minor slips in the drafting stage i.e. misunderstandings, accidental substitutions and omissions. Most of these are clearly made *in scribendo*; and all of these were carried out with considerable accuracy ... in fact, if the errors corrected had appeared visible, they would have given the impression that the text had been written without due precision so devaluing the importance of the work of its writer. After the copyist's corrections, two further hands inserted revisions in the roll, both operating in only a few places and without any attempt to hide their corrections, unlike the copyist ... It is possible that this [*scil.* the second hand, m. 2] is the hand of a proof reader of the workshop where the roll was created. This hypothesis is not completely to be rejected; however, it lacks reliable evidence. Indeed, the fact that the corrections of m. 2 are concentrated in only two consecutive columns leads one to believe that who made these corrections was a reader with particular interest in that section of the script rather than a proof reader having to check the entire roll. A reader was certainly the third person to make changes to the text [*scil.* m. 3] ... his amendments are concentrated all in col. XI. There he recorded a variant on the reading of l. 30, noting it in the upper margin».

9 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, 76-77.

10 Bastianini/Gallazzi 2001, *ad loc.*

instance, at l. 831 he wrote ηδη, but then crossed this out with an oblique line through each letter, writing *supra lineam* the correct reading οἰον.

PBerol. inv. 9872 (BKT II), of the IInd century A.D., is a long papyrus roll (75 columns plus various fragments) that contains a commentary on Plato's *Theaetetus* with a substantial number of corrections. The most recent editors of the roll, Bastianini and Sedley, write: «Il *volumen* è stato sottoposto a revisione e corretto in più punti: parole o lettere omesse nella stesura originaria sono state reintrodotte, lettere o parole superflue sono state cancellate, lettere ritenute errate sono state sostituite con quelle giudicate esatte. Tutti questi interventi non sembrano presupporre necessariamente una collazione con un esemplare diverso da quello di copia (l'affermazione contraria di McNamee 1981, 90 non appare sufficientemente fondata) ... La varietà del modo con cui le emendazioni sono state attuate può indurre il sospetto che il rotolo sia stato corretto a più riprese: una prima mano (quella di un *diorthotès* dello *scriptorium*) ha aggiunto le parole saltate, che sono riportate nel margine superiore ... o inferiore ... oppure sono poste a proseguire il rigo direttamente nell'intercolumnio ... Una mano successiva, o forse più mani, sembrano poi avere ripercorso tutto il testo, cancellando da capo con un tratto d'inchostro tutte le lettere ritenute errate»¹¹.

For example, at col. LXIII, l. 6 the scribe had written προσάλλουτεσχη, omitting some words. In the *intercolumnium* to the left, the corrector has put the sign of an upwards-pointing *ancora* and in the space between ἀλλὰ and οὔτε has written ἄνω; in the upper margin, one can read the words θεωρεῖται οὔτε γὰρ χρωμα κα(τω), which were probably preceded by an *ancora* now lost in *lacuna*. The corrected text is therefore πρὸς ἄλλα θεωρεῖται οὔτε γὰρ χρωμα οὔτε σχῆμα.

11 Bastianini/Sedley 1995, 243-244: «The *volumen* has been proof read and corrected in many places: letters or words omitted in the original drafting stage have been restored, superfluous letters or words have been cancelled, letters judged to be mistakes have been replaced by those considered correct. All these changes do not appear *necessarily* to presuppose a collation with an exemplar different from that of the copy (the contrary view held by McNamee 1981, 90 does not seem sufficiently well-grounded) ... The variety of ways the corrections have been made may lead one to suspect that the roll had been corrected on various occasions: the first hand (a *diorthotès* in the *scriptorium*) added the missing words, which are marked in the upper margin ... or lower ... or are placed after the line directly in the *intercolumnium* ... A later hand or perhaps hands, appears to have gone through the whole text, cancelling with a line in ink all the letters judged to be wrong».

POxy. 2256, of the IInd-IIIrd centuries A.D., contains *hypotheses* of various tragedies by Aeschylus. The fragmentary *hypothesis* of fr. 3 recalls the victory, with the trilogy of which the *Danaids* was a part, against Sophocles and another author, probably Mesatos (l. 5). After the name of the latter and at the beginning of the following l. 6, round brackets can be clearly seen, which are generally used as a sign to indicate expunction in literary texts and non-literary documents. It is clear here that the round brackets were placed *in scribendo*, which can be explained solely by imagining that the scribe copied from an exemplar where the expunctions were already present to indicate that the plays placed between brackets had been mistakenly placed after the name of Mesatos¹². The copy of the Gospel according to St. John contained in *PBodmer* 2 dates to the IIIrd century A.D. The scribe has corrected the text in a variety of ways. There are *supra lineam* additions (ll. 2 and 12) and words rewritten above parts of the text cancelled with a sponge: at ll. 9-10 εταραχθη has been written over a word that has been scrubbed out and which continued in the following line, where the letters σαρτο can be made out in the remaining space; the second part of l. 10 has been rewritten; at the beginning of l. 11 τον is the remains of an eliminated reading, subsequently punctuated with dots as well as small round brackets *supra lineam*.

I turn now to a manuscript that, I believe, provides us with what can be termed an anthology of the techniques and methods available for correcting and improving a text: *POxy.* 2404 + *PLaur.* inv. III/278, a fragment of a papyrus roll (late IInd century-early IIIrd century A.D.) containing a part of §§ 51-53 (*POxy.* 2404) and of §§ 162-163 (*PLaur.* III/278) of Aeschines' oration *Against Ctesiphon*¹³. We can see that the work of proof reading was not limited solely to correcting minor errors as discretely as possible in order to reduce the possibly negative impact of emendations on the appearance of the text (see above the case of the papyrus of Posidippus); in fact, more evident corrections, albeit written with care and precision, have been made, with the apparent aim of improving the text and enabling it to be read according to the intention of the corrector or correctors. As regards punctuation, the scribe provided the text only with *paragraphoi*, whilst copious punctuation was added (at

12 Arata/Bastianini/Montanari 2004, 39, 47-48.

13 *Editio princeps* of *POxy.* 2404: Turner 1957; see also Turner 1980², Pl. VIII and p. 212; *editio princeps* of *PLaur.* inv. III/278: Messeri Savorelli/Pintaudi 1997, 172-174; see also Neri 2003, 511-514; Esposito 2004, 3-4; Colomo 2008 *passim*.

least it is thought) by a later hand¹⁴. Most of these are dots, placed slightly higher than the letters, which had already been written, making sure that they were not above a letter but in the narrow space between the end of the preceding word and the beginning of the next. A lower dot can also be seen at col. I, l. 17. The system can be described as follows: the upper dot combined with the *paragraphos* marks the end of a sentence; the upper dot on its own distinguishes the *cola* of the sentence; the lower dot indicates a weaker pause¹⁵. If we examine the second column (preserved almost in its entirety)¹⁶, which includes the portion of the text (relatively small as the columns are narrow and not high) which goes from § 52.7 τριάκοντα to § 53.7 ὥστε (Dilts 1997 edition, 212–213), we find six upper dots that correctly mark out all the *cola* of the passage (ll. II 5, 8, 12, 15, 16, 22 = ll. 33, 36, 40, 43, 44, 50 in the numbering of the *editio princeps*); two of these dots are also combined with the *paragraphos* (ll. 8 = 36 and 22 = 50) and mark precisely the end of the two sentences that occur in these lines (i.e. they correspond with the two full stops of the modern edition). In the first column, where the beginnings of the lines are lost and the absence of the left margin does not allow us to know whether there were *paragraphoi*, one can note two upper dots at ll. 14 and 22 in addition to the already mentioned lower dot at l. 17. Proof therefore of a serious attempt to highlight the syntactic and rhetorical structure of the text that leads us to consider the role of punctuation in Alexandrian philological exegesis (rather than the complex and idiosyncratic system created by Nicanor, one can mention the simpler and more widely-used system of the three *stigmai* of Dionysius Thrax)¹⁷. Starting from the *editio princeps* of *POxy.* 2404, all corrections have been attributed to a single second hand, although D. Colomo in a recent work states that three subsequent hands can be identified following that of the scribe's¹⁸. As I feel insufficiently competent on this point, believing that further autopsy on the original is required, I will not go into the question, focusing my attention on the changes made in particular in col. II of *POxy.* 2404.

14 See Turner 1957, 130; 1980², 212; Colomo 2008, 15–16. On punctuation marks in papyri, see Turner 1980², 92–93; Turner/Parsons 1987, 9–10.

15 Colomo 2008, 15–16.

16 Only one line is missing at the beginning while the other lines are complete, thereby allowing for a well-founded evaluation. The upper and lower margins remain in the first column so guaranteeing 28 lines per column. The column is however mutilated both on the right and on the left (approximately half the line remains).

17 See Colomo 2008, 15–22; Montana 2009a; D.T., in *GG I/I* 7.3–8.2.

18 Colomo 2008, 24–27; see also Neri 2003, 511–514.

At l. 6 (= 34 of the continuous numbering) the first hand wrote ἐν τοῖς διονυσίοις and the proof reader makes the appropriate correction ἐν διονύσου by putting four dots above the letters of the τοις to be eliminated and writing simply ου above ιοις, without cancelling out these letters, but paying attention to place ου exactly above ιο, so as to avoid possible misinterpretations (e.g., σίου), and to clearly mark the correct reading σου, obviously counting on the fact that the residual ις did not create problems. At l. 21 (= 49) λείαν has been corrected to λίαν by cancelling ε with two oblique lines through the letter; at l. 26 (= 54), the first hand wrote ὅπως which the corrector revises with οὕτως by deleting the incorrect π with an oblique line through and writing υτ exactly above π¹⁹.

More interesting and considerably more intriguing is the situation at ll. II 16–20 (44–48 in the numbering of the *editio princeps*). This is the text of the passage in the codices and in modern editions (Blass 1908²⁰, Adams 1919, Leone 1977, Dilts 1997):

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή μοι παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ τὸ δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν, ἀρχαῖα δὲ καὶ λίαν ὁμολογούμενα.

First, a small point of interest. The medieval codices agreed on δοκεῖν μὲν ἀληθῆ λέγειν, whilst C. G. Cobet had suggested the transposition δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν, rightly accepted by Blass 1908²¹ and later editions²². Our papyrus confirms this transposition: the correct reading ἀληθῆ μὲν is in the primary text and is left unchanged by the corrector.

Apart from this, the textual situation of the passage is complex in that neither the primary text nor the text the corrector produced from it correspond to medieval tradition. The primary text appears to have been:

ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή μοι παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ τι τοιοῦτον καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν κτλ.

Turner observes that «This first reading appears to mean ‘lest I be greeted on your part by some such thing as the impression of telling the

19 According to Neri 2003, 512, the two deletions at ll. 21 and 26 are assignable to the first hand i.e. the scribe, whilst the corrector later added the correct letters at l. 26; furthermore, at col. I, l. 28 Neri suggests that the scribe tried to correct an erroneous ε, but with imprecise results, which led the corrector to add the correct ο *supra lineam*. See Colomo 2008, 26.

20 Unchanged in Blass/Schindel 1978.

21 Confirmed in Blass/Schindel 1978, XXIX.

22 μὲν ἀληθῆ remains solely in the Martin/de Budé 1928 edition.

truth but...’, as if $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \omicron\iota\omicron\nu$ or $\tilde{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ stood in the Greek»²³. Later $\tau\iota\varsigma$ has been added *supra lineam*, positioned carefully between $\mu\acute{\eta}$ and $\mu\omicron\iota$ (l. 16 = 44); $\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ (l. 18 = 46) has been eliminated with two horizontal lines (one drawn through the two words, now faded, the other clearly visible *supra lineam*) and next to that on the right (in the *intercolumnium*) in its place has been written $\theta\omicron\rho.$], which is generally integrated as $\theta\acute{\omicron}\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$. In the next line (l. 19 = 47) $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ has been left, whilst $\tau\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ has been eliminated with a horizontal line through the letters (double lines through $\omicron\delta\omicron$, probably a first, shorter line which was later gone over by a longer line through the whole segment) and $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\omega$ added in smaller writing not in the margin (as was the case for $\theta\acute{\omicron}\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$) but in an empty space in the final part of the line in which the four letters of smaller size fit into the space with only a minimal part extending outside the space on the right (see below). The resulting text is as follows:

ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνο φοβούμενος, μή τις μοι παρ’ ὑμῶν ἀπαντήσῃ [τῖ τοιοῦτον]
 θόρυβος καὶ [τὸ δοκεῖν] δόξω ἀληθῆ μὲν λέγειν κτλ.

The most straightforward scenario is to imagine that the first was the text written by the copyist²⁴ and the second, resulting from the sum of corrections, was the one wanted by the corrector or correctors. A doubt remains regarding the correction at l. 19 (= 47): why did the copyist leave an empty space after $\tau\omicron\ \delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ at the end of l. 19 = 47, a space which was used for adding $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\omega$? There are certainly some irregularities in right side justification, but the space left empty here is perhaps too big (corresponding to around three letters of the normal size). Neri suggests that the scribe himself may have left the space, making the correction later (if however this occurred *in scribendo*, why should the scribe write in a smaller and more compact size?) or he may have deliberately left the space for the corrector, who would fill the space afterwards²⁵. Colomo, on the other hand, thinks that $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\omega$ is attributable to a fourth hand, different from the one who wrote $\tau\iota\varsigma$ between the lines and $\theta\acute{\omicron}\rho\upsilon\beta\omicron\varsigma$ in the margin²⁶.

23 See Turner 1957, 132, *ad loc.*; according to Colomo 2008, 24, here «è stato operato un intervento di correzione attraverso la collazione di un altro esemplare diverso dall’antigrafo, ad opera di due mani diverse, la terza e la quarta» («a correction was made by the collation of another exemplar different from the antigraph carried out by two different hands, i.e. a third and fourth hand»).

24 With an error/omission after $\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$, as suggested by Turner 1957, 132. However, see Merkelbach 1959.

25 Neri 2003, 512.

26 Colomo 2008, 25.

Nevertheless, none of the two textual arrangements correspond to the one passed down by the codices. On publishing the papyrus, Turner wrote, with regards to this passage: «at a place where the text had not even been suspected, there are two alternative readings, both superior to that of the manuscript tradition, no doubt both deriving from different ancient editions»²⁷. Merkelbach rejects this position, defending rather the correctness of the reading contained in the codices, which he regards as superior both to those contained on papyrus. He also attempts to explain that these papyrus readings are the fruit of conjecture²⁸. This opinion was clearly shared by the editors of Aeschines as no edition after the publication of the papyrus questions the readings of the codices (see Leone 1977, Dilts 1997 *ad loc.*²⁹). However, the intrinsic value of the reading(s) of *POxy.* 2404, its position and the importance of the papyri in general in the manuscript tradition of Aeschines is not within the scope of this paper³⁰.

The methods of cancellation used in the papyrus are therefore: the use of dots above a letter, an oblique (single or double) line through a letter in question and, for longer sequences, a line above or through the letters to be deleted, or by a combination of these methods³¹. We have also seen the widespread practice of simply writing the correct letters above those judged incorrect as way of indicating a deletion. Another form of correction is the addition of words between the lines or in the margin. Significant in this discussion is that the exemplar of the oration of Aeschines has been the object of detailed and systematic correction which seeks to: identify textual structure by distinguishing *cola* and periods; correct copying errors and make them evident for the benefit of the reader; emend the text in those places judged unsatisfactory. The view offered by Turner in the *editio princeps* that the work has been collated with a second exemplar is plausible and one that I accept³².

27 Turner 1957, 130.

28 Merkelbach 1959; Turner 1980², 212 appears less convinced about his earlier opinion; Colomo 2008, 30.

29 In Blass/Schindel 1978, XXIX, as regards this passage in *POxy.* 2404, oddly only the reading ὁληθη μὲν is mentioned, whilst no mention is made of the rest.

30 On this question, in addition to the introduction of Dilts 1997, see Monaco 2000 (the papyrus in discussion is examined on pp. 38 and 52, but only as regards the reading ὁληθη μὲν); Colomo 2008, 30ff.

31 Neri 2003, 512; Colomo 2008, 24–25.

32 Turner 1957, 130: «The second hand not only revised the text for errors but collated its readings with an exemplar different from that from which it was copied»; see also Colomo 2008, 24. In spite of the arguments contained in

I wish to stress at this stage why I have drawn attention to these manuscripts and their characteristics. The point here is *not* that they may provide us with insights as to their use and erudite destination³³ or even be considered as an exemplar of a grammarian's *ekdosis*. Rather, I view their value in terms of their highlighting the importance of the techniques adopted in the workshop for book production and the effect such craftsmanship had on the development of a philological practice that sought to improve and emend texts regarded as unsatisfactory due to the errors they contained. The papyri in fact provide ample evidence of the different methods used to correct the copy of a text, cancel what was regarded as erroneous and replace it with what was judged to be correct, by writing it above the line, in the margins and in the *intercolumnia* (at times with specific signs), or also above the preceding words. To delete, a horizontal or oblique line could be drawn through the letters or words to be cancelled, or these letters or words could be marked by dots or lines above or below or enclosed within round brackets or even erased with a sponge³⁴.

As Turner and Parsons write: «One of the questions the palaeographer should ask about any literary manuscript is whether it has been adequately compared against its antigraph (the exemplar from which it was copied), a task which, in a publishing house, was the duty of the *diorthotès*, *corrector*, or whether it has been collated with a second exemplar (a procedure often carried out by private individuals to secure a reliable text) ... But several of our surviving papyrus manuscripts, and especially those which are beautifully written, contain such serious unnoted errors that it is clear their 'proof-reading' was of a summary, superficial kind, if done at all ... Those ancient themselves who set store by having a dependable copy (persons like Strabo and Galen) were aware of this weakness and adopted a routine to counter it: they themselves (or their secretaries) checked the copy to be used against another exemplar. If, therefore, the text had been checked against its first exemplar, and was later collated with a second, it may well bear the marks of this double checking»³⁵.

Best practice in the publishing house (*scriptorium*) consisted in a comparison between copies and corrections, carried out by a profes-

Merkelbach 1959, I find it hard to accept that all is the result of conjecture. On related problems, see above all Turner 1980², 92-93.

33 This aspect has been extensively shown also for instance in Neri 2003 and Colomo 2008.

34 Turner/Parsons 1987, 15-16, with reference to examples in plates; see also Turner 1980², 93 and Pl. VIII; Bastianini 2001.

35 Turner/Parsons 1987, 15-16; Turner 1980², 93.

sional or occasional *diorthotès*, who had adequate resources for deleting, adding, replacing and marking various aspects and features of the text in order to improve it and increase its reliability. Analogies with philological practice are evident and need to be stressed: the methods and techniques adopted in the publishing house offer the skills that were applied and developed by grammarians. A procedure that probably did not appear particularly strange or extravagant, but which implied an extraordinarily innovative principle: in the case of Zenodotus, remembered as the first *diorthotès* of Homer, the *diorthosis* of the corrector of the *scriptorium* became the *diorthosis* of the philologist; concerns and emendments of a specifically publishing and commercial nature became those of a critical and philological-grammatical nature³⁶.

We can imagine this transformation in the following terms. The aim of the corrector in a *scriptorium* was to produce a corrected copy for sale to a client in terms of handicraft in the best possible way. The grammarian's aim on the other hand was to identify the right form of the text he was working on: he worked on a copy in order to produce a model exemplar, in which the form of the literary work he judged exact could be found, including an as far as possible codified indication of doubts and textual aporia. Such an approach did not belong certainly to the intellectual and working world of the *scriptorium* and its craftsmen. In this way, a drastic deletion (typical of the *scriptorium* corrector) was flanked at first by a sign marking a philological doubt, the *obelos*, which represented a fundamental intellectual change because now the work itself rather than the single copy was taken into account. The next steps were the increase in and development of signs indicating textual criticism, study and analysis, essentially not for use in the correction of a copy as a craft product, but as a means of recovering the intention of the author and therefore interpreting correctly the text in question. The *diorthosis* of the grammarian was not concerned with the single exemplar, but the form of the work itself. Some tried and trusted instruments of the *scriptorium* were certainly useful and were used, but the aim and intellectual approach adopted by those who now used them were very different.

This reconstruction, also based on purely material and technical aspects, helps to clarify, on a more solid basis than usual, also the problem of the real nature of the readings attributed by the erudite tradition to the Alexandrian grammarians: conjectures *ope ingenii* based solely on subjective criteria; choice among variants attested by documentary sources and deriving from the collation of copies; a combination of both? These

36 Nickau 1977, 10–11.

questions are crucial in an evaluation of the work of the Alexandrian philologists and their role in the intellectual and cultural history of our civilisation and have been the object of the majority of recent discussions. I have addressed these questions several times³⁷ and here will make only brief reference to them in conclusion.

Personally, I am convinced that the production of an *ekdosis* by Alexandrian philologists, with the work of interpretation this implied, consisted in not only making conjectural emendations, but also in having to choose from the textual variants that came from the collation of different copies. These two aspects have received differing emphasis, with some suggesting that the idea and practice of comparing different copies and choosing from variants generated by collated texts was alien to the Alexandrian critical-philological mindset. Some sustain that the Alexandrians solely or mostly conjectured with the aim of correcting without too many scruples a text judged to be corrupted and unacceptable on the basis of a raft of subjective criteria, such as supposed inconsistency, inappropriateness, material repetitions, preference for greater textual concision, standardisation and uniformity³⁸.

Undoubtedly, the grammarians often conjectured without the support of textual tradition. However, I believe it is impossible not to assign to them the work of comparing different copies and choosing from variants when the textual tradition was not univocal. What we have seen leads us to believe that the work of comparison and selection was not particularly unusual or extravagant. Indeed, how is it possible to imagine that erudite intellectuals considered strange or unorthodox the techniques of the craftsman in the *scriptorium*, which of course they knew very well? And, given that they were familiar to these techniques, would not they want to use, improve and personalise them, for their own needs? This practice implied for the grammarians a real idea of textual criticism as well as of history of the text, even though it lacked methodological rigour. As stated above, correcting a single copy becomes for the grammarian the act of restoring the correct and authentic form of the work itself. The conception of the problem and an attempt to address it even in a primitive and hesitant way represents a decisive and permanent step in intellectual progress: a literary text had its own history of transmission, during the course of which it probably – or better surely

37 Montanari 1997; 1998; 2000; 2002; 2004.

38 Discussion in Montanari 2004. West 2001a; 2001b follows a trend that minimizes the importance of Alexandrian philology, going back to Valk 1963–1964 and returned to recently by Thiel 1992; 1997, criticised not only by myself but also by Schmidt 1997; Führer/Schmidt 2001; Nardelli 2001; Rengakos 2002a; 2002b and Nagy 2000; 2003; 2010.

– has been deteriorated in several parts. Restoring the text to its correct form could be achieved either via conjecture or by choosing the correct reading from those offered by a non univocal tradition. To obtain such a result required tools and methods. The recognition of transmission-induced damage to the authentic text along with steps and procedures to restore it is proof of how the mutual dependency of textual criticism and textual interpretation became established and operational³⁹.

39 See Pasquali 1920: «a costituire un testo ... occorre la stessa preparazione che a interpretare ...; costituire un testo e interpretarlo sono, in fondo, tutt'uno» («constituting a text ... requires the same learning and knowledge as interpreting ...; constituting a text and interpreting it are, ultimately, one and the same thing»), citation from the reprint of 1998, 26.

Pioneers of Grammar. Hellenistic Scholarship and the Study of Language

Lara Pagani

The study of language represents only a minimal portion of the vast field of knowledge and scholarship that in the Hellenistic period was designated by the term “grammar” (γραμματική, *scil.* τέχνη), which today we use to define the study of the normative conventions of a linguistic system on phonological, morphological, and syntactic levels. As some ancient sources demonstrate, “grammar” in its full and complete sense¹ was understood to be knowledge² of literary compositions, accompanied only in some cases by knowledge of what was said and thought in Greek according to common usage.

We know that for Eratosthenes (*ap. sch. Vat.* D.T., in GG I/III 160.10–11) grammar was a «complete *hexis* in letters, where “letters” signify literary

English translation by Johanna Hanink.

I would like to thank Stephanos Matthaios for carefully reading my typescript and for his valuable advice, which allowed me to make improvements to these pages and to avoid some inopportune omissions. I am also grateful to my colleague Serena Perrone for discussing with me some crucial points. It is of course the case that I alone am responsible for the content and opinions expressed here.

- 1 In this sense, it was distinct from the more elementary and restricted discipline that taught reading and writing, for which the name γραμματιστική is attested (see Ph. *De congr. erud. gr.* 146ff. = Chrysipp. Stoic. fr. 99 von Arnim; S.E. *M.* 1.44, 1.47, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.56; *sch. Vat.* D.T., in GG I/III 114.22–28; *sch. Lond.* D.T., in GG I/III 448.12–16); on this point see Steinthal 1890–1891², II 175; Frede 1977, 52; Lallot 1995b, 74; Blank 2000, 402.
- 2 The nature of this knowledge, i.e. whether empirical or technical, was the subject of differing opinions and even explicit polemics in antiquity (see just below): see Pecorella 1962, 59–62; Siebenborn 1976, 116–139; Lallot 1995b, 78–79; Swiggers–Wouters 1995; Robins 1996, 6–10; Lallot 1998², 70–72; Lambert 2000, 390–391.

compositions» (... γραμματική ἐστὶν ἕξις παντελὴς ἐν γράμμασι, γράμματα καλῶν τὰ συγγράμματα)³.

About a century later we have the famous definition of Dionysius Thrax (*ap. S.E. M.* 1.57), according to which grammar is «empirical knowledge, to the greatest extent possible, of things said by poets and prose authors» (γραμματική ἐστὶν ἐμπειρία ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων); the phrase ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον has been interpreted as indicating grammar's goal to be as exhaustive as possible or, by a minority of scholars, as a limitation of the term γραμματική: «grammar is, for the most part, etc.»⁴. The manuscripts of the *Techne grammatike* attributed to Dionysius⁵ report this definition with a slight but important variation (GG I/I 5.1-2): the adverbial phrase, here ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, occurs immediately before λεγομένων so as to indicate «things usually said by poets and prose authors»⁶. According to Uhlig, Sextus' version to some extent distorts Dionysius' original definition preserved in the *Techne*, while Di Benedetto has argued that the definition found in the *Techne* cannot be genuine, given that the restriction of what is «usually» said by poets and prose authors undermines one of the purposes of grammar indicated by Dionysius, namely to explain glosses and rare words: an appeal to prudence on this point has been formulated by Lallot⁷.

Criticism of the empirical nature that Dionysius attributed to grammar may have first been voiced by Ptolemy the Peripatetic (*ap. S.E. M.* 1.60-

-
- 3 On the historical bases, the theoretical and conceptual foundations of this definition, and the cultural backdrop against which it was formulated see Matthaios 2010a, who among other things conducts a meticulous investigation of the meaning of the term ἕξις with regard to its usage in philosophical writings. There it signifies the general concept to which τέχνη is subordinated: according to Eratosthenes γραμματική was an epistemic condition that resulted from or referred to the acquisition and mastery of a special science, i.e. that of written compositions. I have proposed an Italian translation of the word ἕξις in this context in *PAWAG* (www.aristarchus.unige.it/pawag), *s.v.*
 - 4 Advocates of the first position have been Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 196-198; Blank 1998, 124-125; Lallot 1998², 69; Di Benedetto 2000, 395; for the second see Uhlig 1882, 73.
 - 5 On the debate about the work's authenticity see *infra*, 30-37.
 - 6 See Lallot 1995b, 75 and n. 6; Lallot 1998², 43, 69-70 on the other hand, Patillon 1990, 693-694 maintains that Dionysius was referring to «texts, most often those of poets and prose authors».
 - 7 Uhlig (in GG I/I 5.1-2, *ad loc.*); Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 196-198; Lallot 1998², 69. A discussion of the various possible forms, positions and functions of the syntagm ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ / ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον can be found in Ventrella 2004, who attributes a temporal value to the phrase (i.e. something similar to πολλάκις), and therefore translates Dionysius' definition as follows: «la grammatica è pratica ripetuta/esercitata di ciò che si dice presso poeti e prosatori».

61), about whom we know little, but who should probably be assigned to a period shortly after Dionysius himself⁸.

Openly critical of Dionysius' position was a certain Asclepiades, generally agreed to be the scholar from Myrlea who lived between the second half of the IInd and the Ist centuries (see *infra*, 20 and n. 17). Asclepiades maintained that grammar was «a *technē* of things said by poets and prose-authors» (*ap.* S.E. M. 1.74); he thus advanced beyond the notion that grammar was an inherently empirical art (conjectural and subject to accidents, in the same way as e.g. navigation and medicine); his definition also established that grammar was comprehensive, and thus could account for all utterances of the literary authors (*ap.* S.E. M. 1.72-73). In this different conception of grammar Di Benedetto has recognised hints of the beginning of a profound renewal of the grammatical discipline in the course of the Ist century⁹: we shall return to this point.

Sextus (*M.* 1.76) attributes another definition to Chares (Χάρης), who should probably be identified with the Chairis (Χαῖρις) active in about the Ist century B.C. and cited in the scholia to the *Techne* (*sch. Vat. D.T.*, in GG I/III 118.9-11) for the same definition¹⁰. This definition identified grammar «in its complete form» as a «*hexis* that, beginning from a *technē*, allows one to determine as precisely as possible those things said and thought by the Greeks, except for as far as the other arts are concerned» (... τὴν τελεῖαν ... γραμματικὴν ἔξιν εἶναι ἀπὸ τέχνης διαγνωστικὴν τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι λεκτῶν καὶ νοητῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, πλὴν τῶν ὑπ' ἄλλαις τέχναις), thus eliminating grammar's restriction to literature¹¹.

Similarly, Demetrius Chlorus (era unknown, perhaps the Ist century B.C.) spoke of grammar as a «*technē* of the things <said> by poets and <prose-authors and> knowledge of the words which belong to common usage» (τέχνη τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ <συγγραφεῦσι λεγομένων καὶ>¹² τῶν κατὰ κοινὴν συνήθειαν λέξεων εἰδησις).

Another definition, which is of an Aristotelian character and goes back to Tyrannion¹³ (Ist century B.C.), should be mentioned in this context: this definition described grammar as the «theory of mimesis» (γραμματικὴ ἐστὶ θεωρία μιμήσεως, *sch. Vat. D.T.*, in GG I/III 121.17 = fr. 57 Haas). While

8 So Siebenborn 1976, 105 n. 1; less convincing are the arguments of Dihle 1959 in favour of a date in the IInd-IIIrd centuries A.D.

9 Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 199-200.

10 So first Blau 1883, 56-57, followed by Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 198 n. 2; Lallot 1995b, 79 n. 15; Blank 1998, 137-138 and n. 105; *contra* Berndt 1902, 3-18 and 25-28.

11 See Blank 1998, 137-139; for the meaning of ἔξις, see *supra*, n. 3 regarding Eratosthenes.

12 The integration goes back to Di Benedetto 1966, 322 and is accepted by Lallot 1995b, 79 and n. 16, but not by Blank 1994, 146 n. 23, who considers it superfluous.

13 On his role in the study of language in antiquity see *infra*, 21 n. 20 and 61.

this formulation was once considered suspect on the grounds that the text of the scholion may be damaged or incomplete¹⁴, Tyrannion's idea was later explained by means of comparison with Arist. *Rh.* 1404a 21 (τὰ γὰρ ὀνόματα μίμησιν ἔστιν): if language is a μίμησις, then grammar is the theory of this μίμησις¹⁵.

As a result, only a few of the ways in which the grammatical discipline manifested itself were of a linguistic nature: of the six μέρη of grammar identified by Dionysius Thrax¹⁶, only the «study of etymology» and «accounting of analogies» can be considered grammar as such. The later tripartite model of Asclepiades of Myrlea, on the other hand, dedicated a specific section of grammar (μέρος τεχνικόν) to rules concerning letters, parts of speech, orthography, and *hellenismos* (S.E. *M.* 1.91, 1.252)¹⁷; it is upon this and the historical part (focussed on individuals, geographical and chronological information, myths, glosses, and proverbs) that the grammatical part relies (S.E. *M.* 1.252) for carrying out exegesis, textual criticism, and judgments about the authenticity of texts. We know, moreover, that Tauriscus, a disciple of Crates, also dedicated a section of the κριτική (as he called the science of letters) to language and to grammatical features (μέρος λογικόν, S.E. *M.* 1.248)¹⁸. Finally, a strictly

14 So Steinthal 1890-1891², II 177.

15 Haas 1977, 167-168. For a complete study of the epistemological constitution of γραμματική by means of analysing ancient definitions of and observations relating to it, see Prencipe 2002.

16 According to Dionysius (S.E. *M.* 1.250; cf. GG I/I 5.3-6.3) the six parts of grammar are: reading aloud masterfully and in accordance with prosody; explanation of poetic expressions in the text; interpretation of glosses (λέξεις is here a synonym for γλῶσσαι: see Blank 1998, 263) and of histories; discovery of etymology; accounting of analogies; and critical evaluations of literary works.

17 At § 252 Sextus explains the Asclepiadean tripartition (μέρος τεχνικόν, ἱστορικόν and γραμματικόν), discussing at length the subdivision of the μέρος ἱστορικόν; a synthesis of the aspects involved in each individual part occurs at § 91: although here there is no mention of Asclepiades, it is usually agreed that the content of this section is owed to him, given the consistent correspondences (the only discrepancy is purely terminological: the μέρος ἰδιαίτερον of § 91 is evidently the same as the μέρος γραμματικόν of § 252): see Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 203 and n. 3; 1973, 806; Blank 1998, 148, 265. It is generally accepted that the Asclepiades cited three times in the *Adversus mathematicos*, always without ethnic epithet, is the scholar from Myrlea (this identification is oftentimes not even questioned; arguments in its favour are found in Wentzel 1896, 1630 and Rispoli 1988, 179 n. 19, who has moreover refuted [183-184 and n. 33] the hypothesis proposed only by Slater 1972, 331-332 that this Asclepiades should be identified with the Bithynian doctor).

18 The other two parts identified by Tauriscus were the μέρος τριβικόν, concerning dialects and the differences of styles and registers, and again the μέρος

technical component also figures in the quadripartite model of *grammatike* reconstructed by H. Usener on the basis of traces found in the scholastic literature on the *Techne grammatike*¹⁹ and in Latin authors; this model was attributed – in the hypothesis by Usener, which was later rejected – to Tyrannion²⁰. According to that hypothesis, grammar has four μέρη or ἔργα (ἀναγνωστικόν, ἐξηγητικόν, διορθωτικόν and κριτικόν) and as many ὄργανα (γλωττηματικόν, ἱστορικόν, μετρικόν and precisely τεχνικόν)²¹.

In this “restricted” sense of attention to linguistic phenomena, grammar’s roots in the Greek world lie deep in the philosophical tradition²². There the study of grammar began with discussions, first held by the Presocratics, concerning the question of whether language exists naturally (φύσει) or by convention (θέσει or νόμῳ), as well as about the related problem of the “accuracy” of names, that is whether they correspond to the reality that they signify²³.

ἱστορικόν, which had to do with the material that was not systematically organised. For a hypothesis as to the relationship between the divisions made by Asclepiades and Tauriscus see Blank 1998, 264–265.

- 19 Usener 1892 (= 1913): the references to the passages taken into consideration are on pp. 582 (= 1913, 266) n. 1, 584 (= 1913, 267) n. 9, 587 (= 1913, 269) n. 15.
- 20 The system outlined by Usener was based at all levels upon a quadripartite arrangement. It was thought plausible that Tyrannion could indeed have been the creator of a theoretical framework such as this because, in addition to the suitability of his epoch and education, of the evidence provided by his distinction – deemed artificial – of four types of accent (cf. fr. 59 Haas). The objections rested on the fact that such a distinction not only would not have been arbitrary, but indeed was not Tyrannion’s invention; moreover he made use, at least for the typology of the name (fr. 56 Haas), of a *tripartite* structure: see Wendel 1943, 1818; Haas 1977, 171–172; Fehling 1979, 489, who attributes the establishment of this model rather to Trypho. See also Ax 1987, 30–32.
- 21 For a comparison of the various ancient divisions of grammar and a discussion of these, see Steinthal 1890–1891², II 181ff.; Müller 1903, 29–46; Barwick 1922, 215ff.; Mette 1952, *passim*; Ax 1982, 96–97 and recently Bravo 2006, 248–254, with bibliographical references.
- 22 For this phase of ancient grammar here it should suffice to mention only a few fundamental points; for a detailed overview see Schmitter 1991, 57–272; Henigfeld 1994, 4–124; Arens 2000; Blank 2000, in particular 400–404; Schmitter 2000; Sluiter 2000a; Law 2003, 13–51; Frede/Inwood 2005 with further bibliography. A well-documented, though dated, synthesis can be found in Gude- man 1912, 1781–1791.
- 23 Even if not yet formalised, the issue of the relationship between language and reality may be glimpsed in a few fragments of Heraclitus (e.g. 22 B23, 32, 48, 67 D.-K.), Parmenides (28 B8.38–41 and 19 D.-K.), Anaxagoras (59 B17 and

An intense interest in the area of linguistics was also demonstrated by the sophists, who looked to assess the relationships between word, thought, and reality, and in doing so both gave rise to a few morphological classifications and laid the foundations for the art of rhetoric: in particular, Protagoras affirmed the conventional nature of language and distinguished the three genders of substantives (80 A27 D.-K.), along with four verbal moods (optative, subjunctive, indicative and imperative) corresponding to the types of phrases (80 A1 D.-K.; cf. A29). Prodicus is well known as the founder of the scientific study of synonyms (84 A16, 17 and 19 D.-K.), and fundamental to Gorgias' art of rhetoric was the notion of *logos* as a μέγας δυνάστης capable of manipulating listeners' opinions (82 B11.49ff. D.-K.).

The controversy surrounding the accuracy of names was later seized upon and examined in detail by Plato in his *Cratylus*, and to Plato are also owed a number of other important contributions in the area²⁴. These include phonetic classifications and certain observations on the structure of *logos*, such as the distinction between ὄνομα and ῥήμα (*Sph.* 261d): this distinction represents the original nucleus of analysis of the parts of speech which, as we shall see, constitutes one of the fundamental themes of Greek grammatical studies. As to phonetics, we know that Plato identified three classes of letters (vowels, consonants, and mutes: *Cra.* 424c) and two types of accents (acute and grave: *Cra.* 399b).

Aristotle was then responsible for the systematisation of various linguistic concepts and terms²⁵: worth mentioning is *Poetics* §§ 20–21, where we find his extensive classification of the parts of linguistic expression (letter, syllable, conjunction, noun, verb, connecting word, inflection, discourse: 1456b 20–1457b 30) and of word forms (normal, composite, gloss, metaphorical: 1458a 18–1459a 14), all formulated with a view to determining language's, and especially poetic language's,

19 D.-K.), Empedocles (31 B8 and 9 D.-K.), Democritus (68 A37, B5, 9, 26 and 125 D.-K.), to whom Thrasyllus (68 A33 D.-K.) also attributed works on *orthoepeia*, onomastics, and ῥήματα.

24 The investigation of language pervades the Platonic *oeuvre*, but it is the specific subject of (in addition to *Cratylus*) the *Theaetetus* and *Sophist*.

25 As we shall see, recent studies emphasise the Aristotelian influence on Alexandrian scholars, even when it came to linguistics in particular and not only in general terms, as has now been established, in contrast with Pfeiffer 1968, by Montanari 1993, 262–264 (with bibliography at nn. 63 and 67) and Montanari 1994 (in partic. 7–28 [= Richardson 1994], 29–38 [*Discussion*] and 361–364 [*Conclusioni*]). More recently see Schironi 2009, with bibliography.

merit²⁶. Also noteworthy are his studies of inflection and the nature of the verb, which is defined as something that carries an idea of time and is a sign of predication (*Int.* 16b 6ff.); his introduction of the concept of «proposition» (λόγος ἀποφαντικός) in the *De interpretatione*; his elaboration of the idea of ἐλληνίζειν (*Rh.* 1407a 19ff.), i.e. correct expression in Greek (involving *e.g.* exact placement of conjunctions, use of appropriate nouns, avoidance of ambiguity, use of correct agreement of gender and number, production of texts that are easy to read and pronounce), as opposed to σολοικίζειν (i.e. the use of inappropriate terms); as well as his development of a model of communication in the *Rhetoric*.

Stoic philosophy, too, played a decisive role in the study of language and was responsible for investigations of aspects of phonetics, semantics, and syntax, as well as for the establishment of a good deal of terminology that would persist in use. In particular, Stoicism's contributions comprised certain observations on φωνή (thanks especially to Diogenes of Babylon), the doctrine of inflection and of tenses, and the relationship between linguistic form and concept, including the introduction of the notion of anomaly to indicate the discrepancy between signifier and signified (Chrysippus)²⁷.

At a certain point, alongside this philosophy's tradition of linguistic observation, the study of grammar in the field of philology and scholarship came into being and the two entered into a relationship of mutual influence. With regard to the latter, modern critics took up antithetical positions as to the question of whether to accept the idea that a system of grammatical rules (even if still *in nuce*) developed as early as with figures such as Aristophanes of Byzantium (ca. 265/57–190/80), Aristarchus of Samothrace (ca. 215–144) and Crates of Mallus (first half of

26 See Lersch 1838–1841, II 257–280; Ax 1987, 35–37 and Swiggers/Wouters 2002c. A general account of Aristotle's linguistic observations can be found in Ax 1993, 12–15.

27 The canonical reference work on the Stoic theory of grammar is Schmidt 1839; a good deal of space was also devoted to this topic by Steinthal in his overview of ancient linguistics (1890–1891², I 271ff.); the importance of this philosophical current to the foundation of Greek grammatical theory was particularly emphasised by Pohlenz 1939. For more recent studies of the Stoic approach to language see the bibliography of Sluiter 2000a, to which should be added Barwick 1957; Pinborg 1975, 77–98 and, on φωνή, Ax 1986; see also Schenkeveld 1990a and Ax 1993 for the Peripatetic influences on the linguistic observations traceable to the ancient Stoa. Here I avoid an account (even a merely informative one) of Stoic advances in the study of linguistics: when necessary the relevant aspects will be discussed in the course of the paper.

the IInd century)²⁸. The differences of critical opinion are owed largely to the difficulty of interpreting the surviving evidence, which is second-hand, preserved fragmentarily, and generally in need of serious critical examination²⁹, which sometimes involves evaluations of authenticity³⁰. For these reasons and in the light of the recent studies that have organised an important portion of the ancient material and contributed interesting developments to the subject³¹, now appears to be an opportune moment to propose a synthesis of current problems and critical debates³².

As a matter of preliminaries, it seems appropriate to state that the linguistic arguments of the Hellenistic scholars occur along two primary lines: on the one hand, there is the doctrine of the constitutive elements of language, with the crucial question being that of the parts of speech; on the other there is the issue of linguistic correctness (ἐλληνισμός) in relation to individual words (their orthography, prosody, inflection, and meaning) and to constructions (by means of the criteria of analogy, etymology, dialect, usage, and the literary tradition)³³.

The first seeds of this type of study can be detected, beginning in the XIXth century, in overviews of the origins of the study of grammar in the ancient world and in studies, albeit partial and non-systematic ones, of Aristarchus' approach to language, according to what could be gleaned from the fragments of his work on Homer. As to studies with a more general scope, at least those of J. Classen (1829) and L. Lersch (1838-1841) should be mentioned here. Classen addressed – from a

28 Crates was a contemporary, though probably a slightly younger one, of Aristarchus: it is plausible that their work overlapped and that contacts between the Alexandrian and Pergamene schools were more substantial than their traditional rivalry has led us to believe (see Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], XVII-XIX).

29 See the apt formulation of Ax 1982, 98 («... es scheint, als würde die Beleglage jeden Schluß zulassen»); for a close examination of the difficulties specific to this area of study, see also Ax 1991, 276-277.

30 I am of course alluding to the *vexata quaestio* relating to the *Techne grammatike* attributed to Dionysius Thrax: I shall provide an account of the problem shortly, making certain adjustments concerning its importance to my own argument.

31 This is above all a reference to S. Matthaios' work (which I address below) on the doctrine of the parts of speech in Aristarchus, and more generally amongst the Alexandrians.

32 The bibliography is fairly vast: here I retrace a selection of that which I deem most relevant (unless I am guilty of omissions) to the history of scholarship on the subject.

33 See Barwick 1922, 227ff.; Siebenborn 1976, 32ff.; Ax 1982, 97; 1991, 277-278; Matthaios 1999, 15-16.

diachronic perspective – both the philosophical and philological *côtés* (pp. 79–85) of linguistic study in antiquity, hinging the latter on a supposedly sharp and polemical contrast between the Alexandrian and Pergamene schools. He considered the content of the *Techne* to be genuinely Dionysian and therefore a witness to the doctrine of Aristarchus, and he further provided an account of the evolution of a grammatical terminological apparatus that, beginning from an imperfect and nascent form in Aristotle, was enriched by the Stoics and thence reached the Alexandrian grammarians to whom – especially Aristarchus – most of its merit was due. Lersch's volume, on the other hand, combined an historical treatment (discussing Greek, Roman and later philosophers and grammarians) of the ancient debate between linguistic analogy and anomaly³⁴ with both a taxonomy of the parts of speech considered in terms of their development and a history of etymology among the Greeks and Romans.

An interest, albeit an incidental one, in the linguistic aspects of Alexandrians' philology is evident in the studies of K. Lehrs (1837 and 1882³ [1st ed. 1833]), where space is accorded to observations made by the grammarians and Aristarchus on prosodic issues in Homer³⁵. Also strictly related to work on Homer was the research of L. Friedländer, the author of a collection of *Fragmenta schematologiae Aristarcheae* (1853), a study of the systems that Aristarchus adopted so as to manage the particularities and peculiarities of Homer's language³⁶; closely connected to Homer as well was the work of J. La Roche, to whom we owe a rich collection – although one that does not yet attempt a methodical illustration of linguistic principles and argumentation – of evidence for the Alexandrians' explanations of prosodic problems and specific forms in Homer's text (1866)³⁷. The ambition to conduct a systematic analysis of the grammar

34 On this subject see *infra*, 27 and nn. 41 and 44, 28 and n. 46, 29, 38–39, 51–52, 54.

35 Lehrs 1837, 35–166 (*Dissertatio II: Capita selecta ex Alexandrinorum doctrina de prosodia Homerica*); 1882³, 247–327 (*Dissertatio IV, De prosodia: 1. De accentibus; 2. De interaspiratione; 3. De spiritu vocabulorum principali*).

36 The reconstruction of the system can be found in the collection of the Iliadic fragments of Aristonicus: Friedländer 1853, 1–35. According to Erbse 1980, 242–244, this type of approach to Homeric language, of which he studies a few illustrative cases, involved a search for regular repetitions amongst alleged exceptions and presupposed grammatical knowledge such as of the paradigms of declination and conjugation, as well as an awareness of syntactic functions, word forms, and particle usage.

37 La Roche 1866, 175–432. This is effectively a collection in alphabetical order of individual Homeric terms, which in each case investigates the available information relating to textual-critical decisions made by the Alexandrians, on

of Aristarchus became evident for the first time in a piece by W. Ribbach (1883), which right from its title presented itself as a study of Aristarchus' *ars grammatica*. The material that he examined was nevertheless restricted to Aristarchus' application of the principle of analogy and to his observations on orthography, inflection (verbal and nominal) and prosody that could be derived from the fragments of his Homeric exegesis³⁸; it thus excluded matters related to the doctrine of the parts of speech³⁹.

It is within this climate of study that we should situate the overview of the history of Greek and Roman linguistics outlined by H. Steinthal (1890–1891² [1st ed. 1863]), in which attention was also paid to Hellenistic philology, both Alexandrian and Pergamene. Regarding Zenodotus, Steinthal wrote of his «less than finely honed grammatical awareness» and maintained the absence from his work of fixed rules for the construction of word forms, as well as for differences between dialects, and that which was characteristically Homeric⁴⁰. He did however attribute a more important role to Aristophanes of Byzantium, on the basis of the ancient evidence that associated him with Crates of Mallus and Aristarchus when it came to the elaboration of grammar (S.E. M. 1.44). In particular, Steinthal cited Aristophanes' collection of Ἀέξεις as the beginning of a methodical process, and examined his approach to the prin-

the basis of their discussions of grammatical phenomena. The nature and scope of this study are sensibly evaluated by Matthaios 1999, 26.

- 38 It was to Ribbach's merit that he both rigorously arranged and commented upon some of the more important testimonia on the topic (including the fragments transmitted by Varro). For analogy, he sought chiefly to clarify the set of criteria of similarity attributed to Aristophanes and Aristarchus; when it came to inflection he concluded that a complete doctrine on the matter was achieved only by the pupils of Aristarchus, who according to Ribbach used the principle of analogy mostly in determining the correctness of forms.
- 39 According to Di Benedetto 1958 (206 n. 6) and 1959 (118), such a limitation of content was symptomatic of the fact that Aristarchus' grammatical work did not advance any further: Di Benedetto maintains that in fact it was centred exclusively on the study of Homer and therefore did not allow for extrapolation of an autonomous grammatical system. Nevertheless, this lacuna has been filled in recent years by Matthaios 1999, who, beginning with a documented collection of sources, has conducted a reconstruction of the Aristarchean doctrine of the parts of speech, as shall be discussed below (see Matthaios 1999, 26–27 and 192–193 as well for an evaluation of Ribbach's work).
- 40 Steinthal 1890–1891², II 73–77 («... weil sein [*scil.* Zenodots] grammatisches Bewusstsein noch wenig geschärft war, weil er noch keine feste Regeln über den Bau der Wortformen, über die Unterschiede der Dialekte, über das eigentümlich Homerische hatte, um nach ihnen zu bestimmen, was richtig oder falsch ist»).

ciple of analogy as a grammatical rule⁴¹. Steinthal's principal interest, however, was in Aristarchus, whom he credited with a vast knowledge of language, but not yet with a complete grammatical view nor with a complete theory of forms and constructions, which would be established only later by his pupils⁴². Indeed, in Steinthal's opinion, Aristarchus provided these pupils with little more than the principle upon which they could found their grammatical studies, namely the criterion of analogy⁴³. This criterion regulated the system of declination and conjugation, which according to Steinthal Aristarchus knew only in its simplest form, i.e. the comparison of two members, and not in the complete form of four-member proportions⁴⁴. Steinthal also reconstructed

41 Steinthal 1890-1891², II 78-82. Steinthal however denied that Aristophanes was aware of the conditions of analogy (II 151 n.; cf. II 81 n.) and rejected (81-82 n.) the thesis of Nauck 1848, 264-271, according to which Aristophanes defended the regularity of the doctrine of inflection and formulated conditions for the retrieval of analogous inflectional forms in a specific monograph *Περὶ ἀναλογίας*. Because Nauck's hypothesis is not supported by ancient evidence it has then been largely rejected: see Pfeiffer 1968, 202-203; Callanan 1987, 107; Ax 1990, 12; 1991, 282.

42 Steinthal 1890-1891², II 82-111. Steinthal's discussion of Aristarchus' linguistic competence concerned accentuation, the doctrine of forms, syntax, and the parts of speech.

43 Steinthal 1890-1891², II 112-113.

44 Steinthal 1890-1891², II 103; so later also Siebenborn 1976, 71-72; *contra* Erbse 1980, 237-240; Ax 1991, 284 (see *infra*, 53-54). Scholars usually distinguish different applications of the analogical method, on the basis of the degree of refinement and elaboration in the juxtaposition of an uncertain form with a normative model of reference. The comparison of two members provides for the simple juxtaposition of two words: when a form is uncertain – whether in terms of orthography, prosody, sequence of phonemes, or inflection – one can quote as a model a form that is known with respect to that particular aspect, i.e. that is “analogous” to the first according to specific criteria (about the conditions on the basis of which two words are considered “analogous”, see *infra*, 49-50). The grammatical features of the first are then established by means of the features of the second (Siebenborn 1976, 64 mentions as an example of this type of analogy *sch. Lond.* D.T., in *GG* I/III 454.20-21: καὶ τὸ πηρός ὀξύτόνως δεῖ ἀναγινώσκειν, ὡς τὸ πηλός). A more sophisticated procedure allows for the comparison of two “analogous” base words with two respective inflected or derived forms of the words, where the result is a four-member proportion: one of these members is normally unknown and must be determined on the basis of the others (Siebenborn's example, *loc. cit.*, is *S.E. M.* 1.197: ζητουμένου γὰρ τοῦ πῶς δεῖ λέγειν, χρῆσθαι ἢ χρᾶσθαι, φασὶν ὅτι χρᾶσθαι, καὶ ἀπαιτούμενοι τούτου τὴν πίστιν λέγουσιν, ὅτι χρῆσις καὶ κτήσις ἀνάλογά ἐστιν· ὡς οὖν κτᾶσθαι μὲν λέγεται, κτήσθαι δὲ οὐ λέγεται, οὕτω καὶ χρᾶσθαι μὲν ῥηθήσεται, χρῆσθαι δὲ οὐ πάντως: the correct form

Aristarchus' position regarding the doctrine of the parts of speech on the basis of the content of the *Techne grammatike*, which he believed to be a genuine work by Dionysius Thrax (ca. 170–90), an Aristarchean, and which he thus treated as a valid point of reference⁴⁵. Finally, Steinthal appraised Crates of Mallus in antithesis to Aristarchus, pigeonholing him as a supporter of anomaly in the dispute with the analogists⁴⁶: counting Crates more a Stoic philosopher interested in literary history than a philologist, Steinthal hesitated to ascribe to him any serious or even occasional interest in grammatical subjects, and evaluated his competence in this area by comparison with Aristarchus⁴⁷.

The notion that the earliest Alexandrians did not elaborate a system of parts of speech but rather that Dionysius Thrax was the first to do so in the *Techne* also formed the basis of K. Barwick's study on the Roman *Ars grammatica* (1922). This work outlined, among other things, a picture of a bipartite grammatical tradition, consisting on the one hand in the Alexandrian *techne* and on the other the Roman *ars*, both stemmed from a Stoic–Pergamene model which itself derived for Barwick from Diogenes of Babylon's *techne*⁴⁸.

between $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ and $\chi\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ is established thanks to the following proportion: $\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma : \kappa\tau\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota = \chi\rho\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma : \chi\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$). The next step is towards greater abstraction and generalisation: when confronted with a form's dubious orthographical, prosodic, or inflectional features, one subsumes the form under the rule to which it belongs ($\kappa\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}\nu$) and as a result can extract a conclusion about the problematic grammatical feature (cf. *An.Ox.* IV 331.32–332.1: ... ἐν τῷ ἡμερινός ἢ νυκτερινός· τὸ ρι ἰῶτα· ἐπεὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ῥινός καιροῦ παραστατικὰ διὰ τοῦ ι γράφεται: faced with uncertainty as to whether ἡμερινός and νυκτερινός are written with ι or with ει, recourse is made to the rule that temporal indicators terminating in -ρινος are written with an ι: see Siebenborn 1976, 67).

45 See e.g. Steinthal 1890–1891², II 211. We shall soon see how the discussion of the *Techne*'s authenticity has been one of the critical points in the debate as to the linguistic notions of Aristarchus and his contemporaries.

46 Steinthal posed this debate as a central factor in the development of ancient linguistic theory (see also Colson 1919), but it has since been drastically put back into perspective (Fehling 1956, 264–270 has put the historicity of the dispute in doubt, arguing that it may have been constructed by Varro). A history of the analogist/anomalist controversy in modern scholarship can be found in Pinborg 1975, 106–110; Siebenborn 1976, 2–13; Blank 1982, 1–4 and Taylor 1987, 6–8, who support Fehling's thesis; Ax 1991, 289–295; Blank 1994; Schenkeveld 1994, 283–287; Broggiato 2001 (= 2006), XXXIII–XL, with bibliography, and Blank 2005.

47 Steinthal 1890–1891², II 121–126.

48 This thesis was revised by Calboli 1962 and refuted in favour of an unitarian perspective according to which the Alexandrian *techne* descended from the

Precisely in reference to the Pergamene context, H. J. Mette (1952) conducted an analysis of the linguistic theories of Crates of Mallus, employing a rather broad notion of what constituted a fragment. Mette used large passages from Varro and Sextus Empiricus in his reconstruction of Crates' ideas⁴⁹. According to Mette, first, Crates saw linguistic anomaly as the fundamental irregularity of κλίσις, subject to no system of rules, and so set himself in opposition to the Alexandrian view that favoured linguistic analogy; and second, he identified observation of linguistic usage (παρατήρησις τῆς συνηθείας) as the means for establishing *hellenismos*⁵⁰. For Mette, the methodological foundations of these positions could be derived from the medical empirical school, fact that would locate the quarrel between the analogists and anomalists within the broader framework of the opposition between τέχνη and ἐμπειρία in Hellenistic science⁵¹. As to the doctrine of the parts of speech, he credited Crates with a complete and systematic subdivision, but on a purely speculative basis⁵².

Stoic Diogenes of Babylon, and thus the Roman *artes* did so directly as well (so too Pinborg 1975 [see *infra*, n. 84] and Siebenborn 1976, 138-139, 162-163). Along the same lines as Barwick should be placed Frede 1977 (see *infra*, n. 93) and in essence Ax 1986, yet with adjustments (see *infra*, 44), and Matthaios 2002, in particular 190-191 and n. 118, with restriction to the doctrine of the parts of speech.

- 49 Mette 1952 presented as Crates' fragments everything that might complete and clarify the material strictly attributable to the ancient grammarian (e.g. Varro *ling.* 7.109-10.84 [fr. 64a Mette] and S.E. *M.* 1.148-154 and 175-247 [fr. 64e M.]). An evaluation on the nature of this work can be found in Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], XIII-XIV.
- 50 Mette 1952, 9-11 and 31-45. Crates' presumed exclusive use of the terms παρατηρεῖν and παρατήρησις is a controversial claim of Mette's study (see Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], with earlier bibliography).
- 51 Mette 1952, 45-48. This connection, too, is not without its difficulties (see Siebenborn 1976, 118ff. and Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], XXXVII-XXXVIII).
- 52 Mette 1952, 20-21: the presumed Cratetean system was deduced by Varro *ling.* 8.44-84 and should have included ὄνομα in a broad sense (further divided into a more restricted ὄνομα [in turn separated into ὠρισμένον = κύριον ὄνομα and ἀοριστῶδες ὄνομα = προσηγορία] and ἄρθρον [this too divided into ὠρισμένον ἄρθρον = the article and ἀοριστῶδες ἄρθρον = ἀντωνυμία]), ῥῆμα, ἐπίρρημα (μεσότης), σύνδεσμος. More recently, Janko 1995a has presented, as dating back to Crates, a collection of parts of speech and other grammatical terms that may demonstrate a close proximity with Diogenes of Babylon's doctrine of φωνή: it covers accent terminology (περισπᾶσθαι, ἄνεσις, ἐπίτασις); the separation of letters into φωνήεντα, ἡμίφωνα and ἄφωνα; the definition of features of letters, syllables and words as πρόσπνευστις and ψιλότης, ἔκτασις and συστολή, πρόθεσις and πτώσις; the parts of the

The significance of the analogists/anomalists dispute was de-emphasised by D. Fehling (1956), according to whom Crates simply dismissed the value of analogy for determining *hellenismos*, and substituted *συνήθεια* in its place⁵³. Moreover, Fehling maintained that the Alexandrians themselves, in their earliest stages, fully developed a systematic doctrine of inflection: grammatical science in general reached its peak in the age of Aristarchus, with its principal tenets then rapidly becoming fixed in the hands of his disciples⁵⁴. More than twenty years later, Fehling recanted on this formulation (1979), which had been firmly criticised by E. Siebenborn in his study on the doctrine of linguistic correctness (1976)⁵⁵. Fehling now embraced the thesis of a later development of grammar, especially in the wake of the suggestion raised in the meantime by the work of V. Di Benedetto that the *Techne* attributed to Dionysius Thrax was spurious (1958–1959 and 1973).

The contested issue of the *Techne grammatike*'s authenticity is considered a decisive point for our understanding of the origins and first developments of grammatical theory in the Greek world: the *Techne* is a handbook which contains a systematic description of language that, if really the work of one of Aristarchus' pupils, would testify to an already fully evolved awareness of grammatical features in the period. Nevertheless, Dionysius' authorship of the *Techne*, which was both accepted and rejected by scholars of the XVIIIth and beginning of the XIXth century⁵⁶ and then canonised by M. Schmidt (1852–1853)⁵⁷ and by G. Uhlig's

speech ὄνομα, ῥῆμα, πρ[όθεσις] and σύνδεσμος). These are attested in the so-called "Treatise B" of Philodemus (particularly in fragments of *PHerc.* 460 and 1073), which seems to summarise and critique an important adversary's doctrine of euphony: that this adversary was Crates was no more than a conjecture by Janko himself (Janko 1995b, 89–92, where he proposes among other things [pp. 73–87] a new ordering of the papyrus fragments in the various books of the *Περὶ ποιημάτων* on the basis of an innovative method of reconstruction [pp. 70–73]), which he later abandoned (Janko 2000, 182–187) so as to assign all of the material to Pausimachus, one of the «critics» cited by Philodemus. That these texts do not have to do with Crates is assumed by the edition of Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], in which they do not appear.

53 Fehling 1956, 268–269. See *supra*, n. 46.

54 Fehling 1956, 214, 247–248 n. 1, 260–261.

55 Siebenborn 1976, 11–12, 71. See *infra*, 38–39.

56 There is a summary in Di Benedetto 1958–1959, 169–170.

57 Schmidt 1852–1853: the study, based on an analysis of both the manuscript and indirect tradition, sealed the work's judgment as authentic for over a century.

edition in *Grammatici Graeci* (1883)⁵⁸, was first put into serious doubt by V. Di Benedetto in 1958–1959⁵⁹. It must initially be stated that § 1 of the work is not suspected of being a later addition, since it is also cited by Sextus Empiricus (*M.* 1.57, for the definition of grammar and 250 for its subdivision into parts), nor presumably are the next sections up to and including 4, if they are indeed connected to the first section (their subject is in fact ἀνάγνωσις, which is mentioned in Sextus’ testimonium as the first part of grammar)⁶⁰. Section 5 contains a discussion on rhapsody, which is perhaps interpolated and is in any case out of context⁶¹; at § 6 the technical exposition begins, which concerns letters,

58 Uhlig proposed an extensive series of Greek and Latin testimonia which demonstrated overlaps with or resemblances to the *Techne* so as to prove its influence on grammar from the IInd century B.C. onwards.

59 Di Benedetto continued to revisit the subject, responding to criticisms and objections (1973, 1990) and later offering synthesised overviews (1998, 2000). On the debate raised by Di Benedetto, see the outline sketched by Pinborg 1975; Siebenborn 1976, 69 n. 2; Kemp 1991, who embraced the idea that grammatical theory became fully developed, with a formal approach to linguistic analysis, only in the Ist century B.C.; Lallot 1998, Robins 1998.

60 See Di Benedetto 1958–1959, 181–182; 1959, 115; Schenkeveld 1994, 267 n. 13; 1998, 51. This idea is supported by the fact that the content of § 3 (περὶ τόνου) is also confirmed by a citation, explicitly attributed to Dionysius by Varro (fr. 282.5–8 Funaioli). Erbse 1980, 246 (who did not link the issue to the question of the work’s authenticity) argued that the ἀνάγνωσις ἐντριβής of the proem did not coincide with that addressed at §§ 2–4, and therefore that these were conceptually distinct from § 1 and cohered rather with the remainder of the discussion. Di Benedetto 1990, 38–39, explicitly rejected this interpretation, but later modified his own opinion (1998, 152–153 and 2000, 396–397), maintaining that the two concepts of ἀνάγνωσις expressed in the proem and §§ 2–4 respectively were not indeed coincident (according to this opinion, the first indicates the philological practice of determining the correct accentuation of a word, while the second refers to the way in which written texts should be read aloud with due attention paid to accents, punctuation and literary genre, and should therefore be viewed in the context of schooling). Di Benedetto therefore extended his judgment of inauthenticity to cover all of §§ 2–20. By contrast, Lallot 1998², 25–26 (Ist ed. 1989, seconded by Swiggers/Wouters 1995, 91) proceeded in the opposite direction, suggesting that §§ 6–10, on phonetics, should also be included amongst the material of Dionysian origin.

61 See e.g. Di Benedetto 1958–1959, 181; Pfeiffer 1968, 269, who hypothesises that this discussion may not have been entirely out of place in the original, given Dionysius’ interest in Homer and the fact that the rhapsodes were the first “interpreters” of poems. Di Benedetto 1973, 812 instead thought that the presence of this paragraph went back to the scholastic function of the treatise, which was intended for youths learning to read precisely by means of the Ho-

syllables, and parts of speech and upon which doubts of authenticity rest. Di Benedetto demonstrated the existence of internal inconsistencies regarding content and arrangement within the material as transmitted, and these led him to hypothesise that a compiler had intervened. This compiler would have been responsible for the large gap between the first part, which contains Dionysius' definition and subdivision of grammar and is certainly an Alexandrian product (in that it is dedicated to interpretation and textual criticism) and the bulk of the work, which contains a later technical-grammatical discussion⁶². Di Benedetto saw confirmation of his reconstruction in the fact that Sextus introduces Dionysius' writings with the title Παραγγέλματα (M. 1.57), differently from manuscripts' Τέχνη or Τέχνη γραμματική⁶³. There are furthermore three relevant inconsistencies, recognised already in antiquity (*Prolegomena Vaticana*, in GG I/III 124.7-14 and 161.2-8)⁶⁴, between the

meric texts (see also Di Benedetto 2000, 397); Erbse 1980, 247; Schenkeveld 1994, 267 n. 13; 1998, 47.

- 62 See Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 179-185, who also noticed (p. 181) that, of the six parts of grammar mentioned in § 1, only the first is discussed (§§ 2-4). There is no trace of the others, not even the one which Dionysius himself judged most important, i.e. κρίσις ποιημάτων (in his re-elaboration of 2000, 397, Di Benedetto differently identifies the interruption as occurring after § 1: see *supra*, n. 60). Barwick 1922, 13 had hypothesised that in the first section of the *Techne* Dionysius expounded his own view of grammar, and in subsequent paragraphs reproduced a Stoic source (see the response by Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 182). Erbse 1980, 245-246 proposed that the apparent anomaly could be explained if the μέρη of grammar expounded at § 1 were understood not as a kind of plan for the work, but rather as a preliminary presentation of the purpose, nature, and task of philology.
- 63 Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 182 and n. 1. It is actually true that Sextus' formulation does not oblige us to think of a title (ἐν τοῖς παραγγέλμασι = «in his precepts»), but the parallel of the Παραγγέλματα ῥητορικῆς α' attributed to Theophrastus (D.L. 5.47.27) may suggest that Dionysius composed Παραγγέλματα γραμματικῆς τέχνης or γραμματικά: see Fraser 1972, II 680; Di Benedetto 1973, 806 n. 1; Schenkeveld 1998, 42. For Di Benedetto (1958-1959, 182-185), examination of the indirect tradition confirmed the distinction between the first, ancient, part – the part that is in fact presupposed by authors such Asclepiades of Myrlea (IInd-Ist centuries B.C.) and Varro (116-27) (the reference to Ptolemy the Peripatetic is on the other hand less significant, given his chronological fluctuation; see *supra*, 18-19 and n. 8) – and the linguistic section, which is only attested beginning at the end of the Vth century A.D. (Timotheus of Gaza, Ammonius the Philosopher, Priscian).
- 64 Di Benedetto's analysis (1958-1959, 171-178) of the origin of the materials contained in the two *Prolegomena* seeks to demonstrate that the thesis of inauthenticity, which in them is presented as a well-established fact, was not the

content of the *Techne* and what is known from other sources for Dionysius' thought concerning categories such as pronoun, article, noun and verb.

The discrepancies are the following:

1) The *Techne* retains pronouns and articles as distinct (GG I/I 61.1-62.5 and 63.1-69.5), whereas Apollonius Dyscolus attests that Dionysius, like Apollodorus of Athens and in the tradition of Stoic theory, defined pronouns as a special type of article (ἄρθρα δεικτικά, A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 5.18-19; cf. *sch. Vat. D.T.*, in GG I/III 160.28 = fr. 54 Linke);

2) The *Techne* assimilates ὄνομα and προσήγορία into only one part of speech (GG I/I 23.2-3; cf. 33.6-34.2), while the τεχνικοί (the expression that the scholia to the *Techne* use to refer generally to Herodian and Apollonius and which here may rather indicate Apollonius for reasons of content⁶⁵) testify that Dionysius separated them (*sch. Vat. D.T.*, in GG I/III 160.25-28 = fr. 54 Linke), like the Stoics (cf. Diogenes of Babylon, fr. 22.1-5 von Arnim);

3) The *Techne* proposes a definition of the verb as an indeclinable expression, which admits of tense, person and number and has an active or passive value (λέξις ἄπτωτος, ἐπιδεκτικὴ χρόνων τε καὶ προσώπων καὶ ἀριθμῶν, ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος παριστᾶσα, GG I/I 46.4-5), a notion conceptually distant from the definition ascribed to Dionysius by Apollonius, who spoke of «an expression that signifies a predicate» (λέξις κατηγορημα σημαίνουσα, *sch. Vat. D.T.*, in GG I/III 161.6-7 = fr. 55 Linke), thus drawing near to the Stoic position (a very similar pronouncement is attributed to Diogenes of Babylon [fr. 22.6 von Arnim]).

These contradictions were set aside as non-fundamental by Pfeiffer⁶⁶, who maintained that they were «minor controversial points» on which Dionysius' opinions may have wavered. Pfeiffer's thesis, which Fehling later deemed hasty⁶⁷, was the subject of a response by Di Benedetto⁶⁸, who showed that such alleged evolutions of Dionysius' thought are not documented elsewhere and would imply radical changes of historical and cultural positioning.

Objections to Di Benedetto's framework were then raised by Erbse⁶⁹, who dispelled with the first supposed inconsistency by calling attention to a misunderstanding of Apollonius' text: Dionysius and Apollodorus did not call all pronouns ἄρθρα δεικτικά, but only demonstrative pronouns. Re-

hypothesis of an anonymous scholiast but rather the conviction of an entire scholarly school.

65 So Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 207 n. 2.

66 Pfeiffer 1968, 271, followed by Linke 1977, 10-11.

67 Fehling 1979, who writes of «oberflächliche Ablehnung» (488 n. 1).

68 Di Benedetto 1973, in particular 798-801 and 1990, 26-29; see also Pinborg 1975, 105-106.

69 Erbse 1980, in particular 252-258.

cently the issue has been investigated by Matthaïos (1999)⁷⁰ who, in his reconstructed outline of the history of the pronoun (pp. 491–515), explains the expression ἄρθρα δεικτικά as a terminological variant used by the two grammarians as an alternative to ἀντωνομασία / ἀντωνυμία for designating the category of pronouns, and thereby bringing to light their quality of deictically indicating the person to whom they refer⁷¹. Erbse then dismissed the second problem on the basis of the scant credibility of the source⁷², while he mitigated the third by arguing that the first definition of the verb explained its function in a sentence, with the other explaining its formal characteristics⁷³.

This picture was then completed by means of comparison with technical-grammatical papyri from the Ist to the Vth centuries A.D.: Di Benedetto, who detected in the most ancient papyri perceptible discrepancies with the *Techne* when it came to terminology, content, and the order of discussion, recognised on the other hand some similarities in the texts from the IIIrd–IVth centuries onwards; he also pointed out that the first papyrus to contain a piece of the *Techne* (PSI I 18) dates to the Vth century, the same period suggested by the indirect tradition (see *supra*, n. 63)⁷⁴.

70 Matthaïos 1999, 509–515; see already Schoemann 1862, 119–121.

71 Parallels for this kind of alternation in terminology have been found by Matthaïos in Dionysius of Halicarnassus [*Th.* 37.33–34] and in *PBerol.* inv. 9917, on which see Wouters 1997.

72 But see the objections of Matthaïos 2009, 399 on this point.

73 Responses to these arguments can be found in the previously cited Di Benedetto 1990, in particular 20–29. For a summary overview see Lallot 1998; 1998², 19–26; Robins 1998 and Di Benedetto 2000.

74 Di Benedetto 1958–1959, 185–196; to PSI I 18 should be added *PHal.* inv. 55a (Vth–VIth centuries): see also Di Benedetto 1973, 801 and n. 1; Wouters 1979, 109–119 (no. 4), 120–124 (no. 5). Pfeiffer 1968, 270 cautioned against this reasoning, since it constitutes a hazardous *argumentum e silentio*; so too Erbse 1980, 247, who advanced the further objection (p. 248) that the papyrological texts considered by Di Benedetto, inasmuch as they are remnants of schoolbooks, are not suited to comparison with the *Techne*, which is thought to have been intended for scholars rather than students. Di Benedetto 1973, 801–803; 1990, 29–32; 1998, 152; 2000, 398 refuted these criticisms, arguing that the complete silence until the Vth century of the tradition for the *Techne* as the work of Dionysius Thrax would be inexplicable if it had really been composed in the IInd century B.C. (we would have to posit a sort of conspiracy of silence on the part of authors such as Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, Sextus Empiricus and Quintilian: Di Benedetto 1973, 803; 1990, 31; 2000, 398). Apollonius Dyscolus' attitude would seem equally strange, since he treats Dionysius as a grammarian of the second rank, citing him only very rarely (his point of reference is rather Trypho) and certainly not crediting him with the first technical handbook on

This combination of factors would lead us to attribute the *Techne*, in the form in which we now know it, to the IIIrd-Vth centuries, and thus to locate it not at the origins, but rather at the end of the development of Greek linguistic science, which only got underway in the Ist century B.C. with figures such as Tyrannion and Asclepiades of Myrlea and reached the first stages of systematisation shortly afterward with Trypho and Habro⁷⁵.

A more extensive analysis of the issues relating to the authenticity of the *Techne* is beyond the scope of this contribution⁷⁶, but the general

grammar (see Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 209-210; 1990, 31-32; Kemp 1991, 310; Di Benedetto 1998, 152; 2000, 398-399). Nevertheless, Erbse 1980, 247 and then Schenkeveld 1994, 267-268 and 1998, 42-43 rightly urge us to keep the problem of *Techne*'s authenticity separate from that of its authority (on the fact that the model reproduced in the work for centuries was anything but the sole standard handbook, see Swiggers/Wouters 1995 and Wouters 1998). The typological chronology of the τέχναι on papyrus reconstructed by Di Benedetto and retraced by Pinborg 1975, 104-105 and Kemp 1991, 311-315, was then called into question by Swiggers/Wouters 1995 and Wouters 1998: these studies in fact established, on the basis of new evidence, that some papyri from the Ist-IInd centuries A.D. already show notable resemblances to §§ 6-20 of the *Techne*; that certain models of τέχνη may have already existed in the Ist century B.C. and perhaps earlier; that in the Ist century A.D. grammatical science already shows a degree of systematisation such that it justifies unproblematically the *Techne* as we now have it; and that, as a whole, it does not seem that the papyrological documentation can be used to support a late date for the treatise. For grammatical papyri, the standard work of reference is Wouters 1979 (see in particular 38ff. on aspects connected to the *Techne*; for an update see Swiggers/Wouters 2000). See also *TMil. Vogl.* inv. 8, A, B (first half of the IInd century A.D., Bastianini/Lundon 2000) and the Berlin tablet inv. P. 10511-10512 (IInd century A.D.) presented by F. Reiter and F. Montanari at the 26e Congrès international de papyrologie (Genève, August 2010).

75 Di Benedetto 1958-1959, 196-210; 1959; 1998, 151-152; 2000, 399. The birth of grammatical science in the Ist century B.C. was hypothetically linked by Di Benedetto (1958-1959, 202) to factors such as the need to preserve classical Greek usage; contact with Roman culture, which brought with it confrontation on a linguistic level; and the role of Rhodes, where mutual contact between rhetoric (Apollonius Molon) and grammar (Dionysius Thrax) may have favoured the establishment of the two disciplines' respective boundaries, with linguistic instruction falling under the domain of the second. Pinborg 1975, 133, added to these factors the general tendency in the period to collect observations made by predecessors in systematic handbooks (see also Fuhrmann 1960, 154-155).

76 In recent years its authenticity has been defended by Janko 1995a, 215-216, on the basis of the observation at § 12 of the *Techne* that only the *neoteroi* constructed matronymics, and not Homer: since it fully coheres with the Alexandrian philological spirit, this observation seems in Janko's opinion to support

picture does in any case advise against using the treatise as proof that an evolved system of grammar existed amongst the earliest Alexandrians⁷⁷. By contrast, the fact that the genuineness of the *Techne* has proven problematic does not itself preclude the existence of linguistic theorisation in the early Hellenistic period⁷⁸. In this respect a crucial corrective has, in recent years, been brought to light: even if the current text of the linguistic discussion in the *Techne* is spurious, the initial section, with its definition and division of grammar, is certainly by Dionysius; as a result, it is true that he did not write *that* work, but did nevertheless compose *a* work on a grammatical subject. We should recognise that the content of those sections which are positively authentic does not suggest a complete and technical exposition of morphology and the parts of speech; it does however allow us to infer a structure that was to some extent systematic, as well as to identify an incipient awareness of the autonomy of the discipline, which in true Alexandrian spirit was understood as a

ascribing the entire work to that context and thereby to save it from suspicions of inauthenticity. Dionysius would at first have adhered to the Stoic doctrines derived, perhaps by means of Apollodorus, from Diogenes of Babylon, then modified them until they reached the form that we find in the *Techne* (on Apollodorus' role as an intermediary between Stoic advances and Alexandrian scholarship see Frede 1977, 52 and Schenkeveld 1984, 348). To this Janko 2000, 178 and n. 1 has added, in support of the *Techne*'s authenticity, the presence within it of remarks on euphony (GG I/I 11.5–12.4), the importance which it attributes to κρίσις ποιημάτων (GG I/I 6.2–3), and the presence of influences from Stoic grammar. On the other hand, without taking a position on the work's authenticity, Matthaïos 1999, 265, 282–283, 623 has demonstrated how at least part of the material that it contains is congruous, on a theoretical level, with Aristarchean doctrines and therefore may plausibly have ancient origins (see *infra*, 59). Alongside this group of points of contact – a sort of common heritage of ancient grammatical thought – there also emerge (Matthaïos 2009) substantial conceptual and taxonomic differences between the *Techne* and the positions held by Aristarchus (in particular pp. 395–398), not to mention discrepancies between the doctrines relating to the system of parts of speech attributed to Dionysius Thrax by testimonia external to the *Techne* and that which is present within it (in particular pp. 398–399). In its conception the systematic section of the *Techne* is thus later than, though still in the tracks of a tradition leading back (in that it has to do with the parts of speech) to the Aristarchean framework. The grammatical theory presupposed by Dionysius was on a different front, and may represent the first attempt to instill linguistic developments of the Stoic school within the Alexandrian scholarly tradition.

77 The grammatical theory displayed in the *Techne* is regarded as representative of the linguistic knowledge of Alexandrian scholarship by Robins 1957.

78 As we shall see, related conclusions should instead be drawn from that which is definitively known, even in a fragmentary and indirect way, about the approach of ancient scholars to linguistic matters.

combination of philological and linguistic study aimed at the interpretation of literary texts⁷⁹.

The arguments against the authenticity of the *Techne* were considered of little substance by Pfeiffer (1968)⁸⁰, who saw in this work the peak, with noteworthy influence from the Stoic tradition, of grammatical science as a stand-alone discipline in the Hellenistic period. For him this discipline arose out of general philology, which initially applied it for purposes of textual criticism and exegesis. The first steps in this direction consisted in the “preparatory work” represented by Aristophanes’ Λέξεις⁸¹ and by his investigations into recurring patterns of inflection, which led him to recognise the fundamental principle of regularity known as analogy that was later both practiced and improved by Aristarchus⁸². Within these lines of development, which viewed

79 The issue, profiled already by Ax 1986, 228–229, is well-recognised by Montanari 1993, 255–256, Schenkeveld 1994, 269; Montanari 1994, 302–303 (*Discussion* of the contribution by Schenkeveld). Entirely dedicated to the linguistic content of the Παράγγελματα is Schenkeveld 1998, according to whom Dionysius’ treatise should have also contained something like a formal description of language (resulting from a fusion of the findings of predecessors’ scholarship and Stoic observations on the subject), probably in the section entitled «exegesis according to poetic modes of expression» (Schenkeveld 1994, 291–292). On the other hand, Di Benedetto 2000, 396 judges it inconceivable that something so important as specific discussion of the science of grammar could have been included in Dionysius’ work without also being cited in the subdivision of γραμματική. Di Benedetto further maintained that there was no reason to locate that discussion within the study of poetic modes of expression, rather than within the treatment of any other of grammar’s μέρη. On the subject see also Blank 2000, 407–408.

80 For his stances on individual points, see *supra*, 33. Pfeiffer 1968, 272 however recognised that the modern arrangement of the *Techne* does not correspond to the original one, and hypothesised a lacuna after the present § 4, where, in his opinion, an editor had later intervened in an attempt to rewrite what remained of the original.

81 Within this lexicographical collection Pfeiffer highlighted in particular a section Περί τῶν ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρησθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς (fr. 1–36 Slater), from which he inferred an interest in the historical aspects of words, particularly with regard to chronological distinction between ancient and modern usages (Pfeiffer 1968, 197–200; but see *infra*, 48 and n. 121). On the other hand, the content of some fragments, especially those relating to greetings and dialectal forms, suggests attention to contemporary spoken language (Pfeiffer 1968, 202). These two aspects of Aristophanes’ work are considered in relation to his practice of analogy by Ax 1990 (see in particular 13–14).

82 For Pfeiffer these studies were strictly connected to philological investigations, and did not trespass onto the philosophers’ disputes about the relationship be-

grammatical science as the final achievement of Hellenistic philology, Pfeiffer found confirmation for his highly limiting notion of Aristotle's role in the birth and evolution of Alexandrian scholarship, which he argued would have been much more directed towards linguistic studies had it indeed been influenced by the philosopher⁸³.

The evolutionary path of grammar traced by Di Benedetto was accepted by J. Pinborg (1975), who outlined a conceptual distinction between accumulations of individual linguistic observations, abundant ever since Aristotle and the Stoa, and the incorporation of these into a coherent grammatical system, something which would not occur until the 1st century B.C.: the Alexandrian scholars hardly aimed to establish a linguistic system, but rather sought to interpret the poets. In the course of doing so, however, they may have occasionally made use of and perhaps even described some grammatical categories⁸⁴.

The view that the philologists of the IIIrd-IInd centuries B.C. were interested exclusively in the study of literature was also sustained by E. Siebenborn in his study of the doctrine of *hellenismos* (1976)⁸⁵, which investigated among other things the application of the principle of analogy to determining the correct forms of words⁸⁶. In Siebenborn's opinion, Aristarchus used in most cases this criterion as a heuristic method for establishing correct prosody, and not for determining inflectional

tween words and things (see Pfeiffer 1968, 203). Apropos of Aristophanes' supposed monograph *Περὶ ἀναλογίας* see *supra*, n. 41.

83 So Pfeiffer 1968, 272. For recent adjustments made to this interpretation, see *supra*, n. 25.

84 Pinborg 1975, 103-106 (on the *Technē*), 106-110 (on analogy and anomaly, with reference to the opinion of Fehling 1956, 264-270, on which see *supra*, 30), 110-114 (on the development of grammatical theory in the Hellenistic period). Pinborg considered Di Benedetto's results comparable to Fehling's, certainly not in terms of their chronologies of grammar's beginnings, but because of the similarity of approach that had led both to maintain that Greek grammatical theory represented a unitary system equipped with uniform criteria and methods. In fact, according to both Di Benedetto and Fehling the existence of conflicting opinions as to individual points did not require that the ancients create completely different versions of grammar.

85 Siebenborn also accepted Di Benedetto's position on the inauthenticity of the *Technē* (see in particular Siebenborn 1976, 27 n. 2 and 69 n. 2).

86 The three principal criteria for linguistic correctness lay in analogy (Siebenborn 1976, 56-84), the literary tradition (85-89), and usage (90-97); complementing these were etymology (140-146), *διάλεκτος* (146-151) and, in the Roman world, *natura* (151-154) and *euphonia* (154-155).

endings⁸⁷. On the other hand, Siebenborn maintained that the set of conditions of analogy observed by Aristarchus was restricted to simple comparisons of words, and did not go so far as to constitute a system of concepts and rules for declension and conjugation⁸⁸. For Siebenborn Aristarchus and his contemporaries thus did not get beyond recognising a certain regularity in the morphological structures of language; it was only at the end of the IInd century B.C. that the grammarians began to concern themselves first with demonstrating the scientific nature of their discipline and then with founding a system of concepts and rules⁸⁹.

A reduced role in founding the grammatical science was also assigned to Alexandrian scholarship by M. Frede (1977), who rejected that the *Techne*, which he took to be authentic, could represent an elaboration – let alone codification – of a grammatical system assumed by philologists in the period immediately before Dionysius⁹⁰: in fact, ancient sources do not attribute any of these philologists with a work on linguistics.

87 This conclusion was based on a study of the various passages from the scholia (Siebenborn 1976, 70ff.), all of which, however, go back to Herodian: according to Matthaïos (1999, 28–29), a similar selection of material produces a partial result, which should not form the basis of generalisation: it is clear that the material from Herodian which was gathered within the scholia preserves fragments on prosody, while other sources, such as Aristonicus and Didymus, suggest a different picture (on this point see fr. 48–53 Matthaïos and the overview of Aristarchus' concept of case at pp. 287–289: see *infra*, 57ff., for more detail on Matthaïos' arguments).

88 In fact, according to Siebenborn (1976, 71–72 and 76–77), the Aristarchean tradition is dominated by the so-called two-term analogy, while there is no trace of four-member proportion (see *supra*, n. 44); it is nevertheless important to consider that the formula «x is like y» does not necessarily presuppose a comparison of words connected by a formal relationship of analogy, but may indicate that the accentuation or vocalism of word x, unknown in this regard, is *the same as* that of term y, which is known (so Callanan 1987, 116, and later Matthaïos 1999, 29–30). A sizable portion of presumed Aristarchus' two-term analogies would thus have acted as “examples”, exempt from the formal restrictions of analogy (see Matthaïos 1999, 30). In this way cases where the rule of equal syllable-number is not observed (such as φυλακοῦς-φρουρούς [*sch.* Hdn. II. 24.566d¹] and φωριαμῶν-κιβωτῶν [*sch.* Hdn. II. 24.228a]), and in which Siebenborn 1976, 77 saw «eine Lockerung der Rigorosität», might be explained. On the other hand, the idea that Aristarchus also knew of the four-member proportion and employed it to deduce grammatically-correct forms has been convincingly demonstrated by Erbse 1980, 237–238 (see *infra*, 40–42).

89 Siebenborn 1976, 70, 84, and 97.

90 Frede 1977, 56; he makes cursory reference (p. 52) to the issue of authenticity raised by Di Benedetto 1958–1959, dismissing the problem with the remark that «nowadays the text is generally accepted as genuine».

tic matters, and at most Aristophanes and Aristarchus might be credited with a certain interest in the rules of inflection, a subject which in any case is not addressed by the *Techne*⁹¹. Frede instead emphasised the role of Stoic dialectic in the development of the theory of language, highlighting how the Stoics, although they never composed a grammar, had attempted to develop an elaborated theory such as could determine what should be accepted as correct Greek⁹². In fact, he considered the influence of the Stoics' linguistic project to be so great that he described the work of later grammarians as a revival of some well-defined aspects of its⁹³.

On the other hand, H. Erbse (1980) contested Di Benedetto's and Siebenborn's reconstructions, attributing to the Alexandrians knowledge of a notable system of grammatical rules that was already fairly advanced, albeit one still in need of improvement: without this they would have been unable to solve the linguistic problems posed by the poetic texts which they were investigating⁹⁴. Erbse supported this conclusion with a study of the Aristarchean testimonia in the Homeric scholia that 1) made recourse to the concept of analogy, 2) had to do with the so-called *schematologia Aristarchea*, and 3) demonstrated awareness of grammatical terminology.

1) Recourse to analogy presupposes recognition of linguistic regularities, according to Erbse⁹⁵, who on this point cited the following fragments: *sch. Hdn. Il. 24.8a* (fr. 92A Matthaios), which offers a direct citation of Aristarchus concerning the accentuation of *πείρων*, determined on the basis of

91 According to Frede 1977, 56, in order to salvage the assumption that the origins of grammatical science were Alexandrian, one would have to imagine that it had been developed by Dionysius himself (though in the same pages Frede then warned against doing so, pointing out that the *Techne* is a very elementary handbook, in which a rich system has been reduced to definitions, classifications, and basic examples – certainly not the kind of text that would have been written so as to introduce a new discipline of such interest and importance).

92 Frede 1977, 76.

93 Frede 1977, 76–77. In this regard the figure of Diogenes of Babylon is considered particularly significant, since his influence is seen by Frede as lying at the origin of both the Pergamene (Crates of Mallus and later the Roman *artes*) and the Alexandrian (Apollodorus of Athens, Dionysius Thrax) traditions.

94 Erbse 1980, 241; he therefore shared the original position of Fehling (1956, in particular 214, 247–248 n. 1, 260–261), who however had in the meantime been persuaded by the interpretation of Di Benedetto and Siebenborn (see also Erbse 1980, 237).

95 Erbse 1980, 239.

the comparison ἔκειρε : κείρων = ἔπειρε : πείρων⁹⁶; *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 9.150a, *sch.* ex. *Il.* 14.464a, *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 16.123c (fr. 27A M.), 16.390e, which use terms such as ἀναλογία and ἀνάλογος -ον (ο -ως) in connection to explanations made by Aristarchus; *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 1.493a, 2.592b, 3.198a, 12.158, *sch.* Did. *Il.* 12.231a, which testify to cases in which Aristarchus has chosen readings that neglected or violated the analogy (we find expressions such as παραλόγως or παρὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν)⁹⁷.

2) The *schematologia Aristarchea* denotes the set of systems which Aristarchus used to account for the unusual features of Homeric language, and according to Erbse suggests a search for regularities by which to understand apparent irregularities⁹⁸. The examples which he considers in this respect are: *sch.* Ariston. *Il.* 1.175a, where the expression κε ... τιμήσουσι is justified either by a pleonasm of the modal particle or by the use of the future indicative in place of an aorist optative; *sch.* Ariston. *Il.* 2.286, on the use of the present tense in place of the future; Pap. II Erbse *ad Il.* 785 (*POxy.* 1086 l. 55), where the genitive of the phrase διέπρησσαν πεδίοιο is explained by the presumed omission of the preposition διὰ; *sch.* Ariston. *Il.* 4.331a, on the use of a middle form in place of an active one.

3) Regarding terminology, relevant evidence includes *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 24.8a (fr. 92A M.; see just above), which attests the term παρατατικός for the imperfect; and A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 62.16-17 (fr. 120A M.), on Aristarchus' coinage of the name ἐπιταγματική [*scil.* ἀντωνυμία?] for forms of αὐτός used alongside the tonal forms of personal and possessive pronouns. This evidence is, however, not sufficient to claim that Aristarchus was already aware of the terminology known to us from the *Techne* of Dionysius⁹⁹: other sources indicate that many expressions used in later grammar (and also in the *Techne*) were in fact unknown to Aristarchus, e.g. those used for indicating verb tenses¹⁰⁰.

On the basis of this overview Erbse concluded that the paradigms of declension and conjugation, the syntactical functions of words, and the uses of particles were all known to Aristarchus¹⁰¹. The picture reconstructed as such was then upheld by Erbse's examination of the value of

96 This confirms that Aristarchus used the more developed form of analogy, which Siebenborn (see *supra*, n. 88), who did not consider this passage, denied to have been the case.

97 To these examples Ax 1982, 101 n. 19 proposed adding *sch.* Ariston. *Il.* 2.397a and *sch.* Did. *Il.* 2.397b-c (fr. 81B, 81A¹ and 81A² M.), on the Homeric use of plural verb forms with neuter plural subjects.

98 See *supra*, 25 n. 36.

99 So Erbse 1980, 238, on the basis of the first testimonium.

100 See Matthaios 1999, 31, 327 and 340-351.

101 These conclusions have been criticised by Callanan 1987, 17-19; see also Taylor 1987, 11-12; Schenkeveld 1984, 349 and n. 157; 1994, 285; 1998, 41 and Matthaios 1999, 30-31.

the *Techne*, whose authenticity he defended against the arguments of Di Benedetto¹⁰². Furthermore, in accord with Pfeiffer (1968), he placed this handbook within the history of ancient scholarship «als Spätform der hellenistischen Fachschriftstellerei»¹⁰³.

On the same front but in a less radical manner, W. Ax produced a series of studies on various aspects of the problem (1982, 1986, 1990, 1991). He in no way denied the practical-philological orientation of Alexandrian scholarship, but demonstrated how the Alexandrians' approach to the linguistic difficulties of texts implied knowledge, albeit empirical in nature, of an apparatus of linguistic description and an awareness of the existence of regularities, though not the foundations of a complete and articulated system. So as to describe this type of grammatical competence, Ax spoke, with regard to Aristarchus, of a «Grammatik im Kopf»¹⁰⁴. In his first work on the subject (1982), he considered various fragments of Aristarchus transmitted by Apollonius Dyscolus¹⁰⁵ in order to determine his place within the general picture of grammar's development. Given that in Apollonius, too, Aristarchus appears as a Homeric exegete (not surprising at all), some passages have to do with linguistic observations relating to Homeric usage. These consist in notes on individual words and on the general use of certain parts of speech and these remarks both took as their starting point and had as their objective Homeric linguistic usage – usage that was carefully observed, structured by means of rules, and consulted as the paradigm when it came to doubtful points of textual criticism¹⁰⁶.

The fragments taken into consideration have to do with:

102 The objections raised by Erbse as to individual points made by Di Benedetto are mentioned *supra*, 33–34.

103 Erbse 1980, 258; see also Pfeiffer 1968, 272: «Very late, and under the influence of Stoic doctrines, an Alexandrian scholar constructed from observation (ἐμπειρία) of the language of poets and prose writers a 'system of γραμματική' that is a τέχνη. The lateness of its appearance, often regarded with surprise, is in harmony with the line of development we have traced from the third to the first century B.C.» (see also *supra*, 37).

104 See in particular Ax 1982, 109 and Ax 1991, 288, where this apt formulation appears.

105 Ax chose to concentrate on Aristarchus because the testimonia for him are the most numerous and explicit; by programmatically excluding scholastic sources from his research he aimed to avoid a constrictive preponderance of Homeric text and language. Apollonius Dyscolus was favoured, instead of e.g. Herodian, so that fragments of the most general or most generalisable nature might be used (1982, 101).

106 Ax 1982, 102–104.

1) the pronoun: a) on a specific level: ἐμοῖο, σοῖο, οἷο are Thessalian forms (A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 109.4–5 [fr. 133 M.]); 2) on a general level: third-person pronouns, when accented, have a reflexive meaning (*ib.* 42.17–25 [fr. 123B¹ M.]); possessive pronouns are usually reflexive (*ib.* 48.7–11 [fr. 130B M.]); Homer is infallible in his use of pronouns (*ib.* 109.20–23 [fr. 104B M.]); Homer avoids using overlapping forms for personal and possessive pronouns (A.D. *Synt.*, in GG II/II 222.12–223.15 [fr. 128B M.]);

2) the article: the article is generally omitted (*ib.* 6.4–11 [fr. 99A¹ M.] and 106.1–107.8 [fr. 99A² M.]);

3) the adverb: ὧδε, usually used in a locative sense, is in Homer used only modally (A.D. *Adv.*, in GG II/I 178.25–27 [fr. 157C M.]);

4) the conjunction: Homer has the habit of putting in first position causal phrases containing the conjunction γάρ (A.D. *Conj.*, in GG II/I 239.23–27 [fr. 173B M.]).

A second group of fragments contains general remarks by Aristarchus on the Greek language; these unequivocally demonstrate an interest (also) in linguistic issues unconnected with the Homeric texts, in relation both to *hellenismos* and to the parts of speech¹⁰⁷.

The fragments contain observations concerning:

1) the noun: nouns are declinable and therefore subject to agreement (A.D. *Adv.*, in GG II/I 145.5–10 [fr. 136 M.]);

2) the pronoun: a) on a specific level: plural forms of third-person “composite”, i.e. reflexive, pronouns [*scil.* ἐαυτῶν, ἐαυτοῖς...] are unacceptable for reasons of syntactic tolerability, inflectional analogy, and comparison with Homeric language (A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 71.20–29 [fr. 125A¹ M.] and *Synt.*, in GG II/II 244.10–245.5 [fr. 125A² M.])¹⁰⁸; the pronoun αὐτός can also be called ἐπιταγματική [*scil.* ἀντωνυμία?], i.e. a “subsidiary” (or “supporting”) pronoun, inasmuch as it can be used alongside every accented personal pronoun and possessive pronouns in the genitive (A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 62.16–17 [fr. 120A M.: see *supra*, 41]); b) on a general level: description of pronouns as «expressions that form a series according to person» (λέξεις κατὰ πρόσωπα σύζυγοι, A.D. *Pron.*, in GG II/I 3.12–13 [fr. 103A¹ M.] and *Synt.*, in GG II/II 137.9–138.9 [fr. 103A² M.]);

107 Ax 1982, 104–108. Callanan 1987, 19 and nn. 41, 42 gave less importance to this second group of evidence, highlighting how Ax himself attributed to Aristarchus the possession of an elaborated system of rules governing Homeric language but spoke only of an “interest” in general issues of grammar (Ax 1982, 108: «Aristarch war nicht nur im Besitz eines komplexen Regelwerks zur homerischen Sprache, sondern war darüber auch an gemeingrammatischen Frage interessiert»); nevertheless, see Ax’s wording at 1991, 287: «... daß Aristarch ... Fragen der Morphologie als Gegenstand *sui generis* behandelte».

108 See Siebenborn 1976, 30–31.

3) the adverb: a) on a specific level: the word ἄνεω is an adverb (A.D. *Adv.*, in GG II/I 144.11–145.10 [fr. 136 M.]); b) on a general level: adverbs are indeclinable and therefore not subject to agreement (*ib.* 145.5–10);

4) the article: ὃ before a vocative is not an article (A.D. *Synt.*, in GG II/II 71.10–72.2 [fr. 98 M.]).

Ax recognised that it was not possible to determine what weight Aristarchus attributed to such matters, nor to ascertain whether he had somehow combined them thematically or considered them coincidental, secondary results of his philological work. In any case, the evidence indicates that his linguistic observations were advanced enough in terms of both level and degree of autonomy to make it plausible that even his immediate students sought to systematise grammar¹⁰⁹.

Ax also achieved further results concerning the history of the origins of grammatical science in a study dedicated to the section περὶ φωνῆς (1986), i.e. to language's subdivision starting from sound: both this and the model of linguistic description connected to it prove to be a sort of “guide fossil”¹¹⁰ that can aid in recovering the relationships of dependence which existed within the Greek and Roman grammatical tradition. He adopted the bipartite evolutionary model of Barwick (1922)¹¹¹, but adjusted the lines of development: both the *technē* of Diogenes of Babylon and the “Roman” *technē* (he avoids the designation “Pergamene *technē*”) had split off from an ancient Stoic original; the Alexandrian *technē* on the other hand derived from that of Diogenes, but was also influenced by the “Roman” one, from which the Roman *ars* then directly descended – which in turn would also be influenced by the Alexandrian type (with Varro and Remmius Palaemon)¹¹².

Later studies by Ax (1990 and 1991) also addressed Aristophanes of Byzantium's approach to language, which in the meantime had been the specific subject of a piece by C. K. Callanan (1987). Callanan conducted an analysis of Aristophanes' surviving fragments in order to reconstruct

109 Ax 1982, 109.

110 Ax 1986, 252.

111 See *supra*, 28 and n. 48. For Ax the Alexandrian model was excluded as a direct antecedent of the Roman *artes*, since (like the model of Diogenes) it differed from them in its definition of φωνή; its division of φωνή into four types (there were only two in the Roman model); and its presentation of the parts of language as two groups dependent upon the two respective types of φωνή, the first being subordinate to the second: λέξις and λόγος (instead of a continuous sequence as in Roman grammar): see Ax 1986, 242–243 and 249–250.

112 Ax 1986, 249–252. The validity of this reconstruction has been called into question by Schenkeveld 1990b, 298–306 (see also Schenkeveld 1990a).

his approach to the formal aspects of language, issues relating to semantics and the fields of etymology and analogy.

As to the first of these points, Callanan highlighted Aristophanes' awareness of the existence of alternate forms for the same word, citing two sets of examples¹¹³: 1) Aristophanes' presentation of the variants μολόβρια / κολόβρια (fr. 197 Sl.), πόριες / πόρτιες / πόρτακες (fr. 155–158 Sl.), φορίνης / πυρίνης (fr. 344 Sl., though the reading of this fragment is problematic: see the text and apparatus of Slater 1986, 117) and τάγηνον / τήγανον (fr. 26 Sl.) and 2) the grammarian's preference, usually on the basis of etymological arguments, for the form ἄεπτος over ἄαπτος (fr. 418 Sl.), for πτήξε over πῆξε in *Il.* 14.40 (*sch.* Did. *Il.* 14.40b; p. 184 Sl.), for ἴσθη over εἰσίθη in *Od.* 6.264 (*sch. ad loc.*; p. 198 Sl.), for παρὰνύμφιος over παρὰνυμφος (fr. 280–284 Sl.: see *infra*, 49). Callanan also stressed Aristophanes' knowledge, however empirical, of the regularity of changes in accent due to inflection¹¹⁴, citing as a key witness *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 15.606b (p. 187 Sl.). There the accentuation of τάρφειν is discussed in relation to its pertinence to the inflection of either the noun τάρφος or the adjective ταρφύς: in the first case, the dative plural would be τάρφειν, like βέλεσιν for βέλος; in the second it would be ταρφέσιν, like ὀξέσιν for ὀξύς¹¹⁵. Callanan further highlighted, using two fragments preserved in Herodian, Aristophanes' knowledge of descriptive norms for the prosody of word-groups meeting certain requirements¹¹⁶. The first of these fragments has to do with the prosody, in Attic, of comparative ending in -ων (Hdn. in *GG* III/II 13.14–17 [fr. 347 Sl.]), while the second may involve a rule of Aristophanes' concerning words of more than one syllable ending in -ιξ (*GG* III/II 9.10–13 [fr. 346 Sl.]).

Regarding nouns¹¹⁷, the following emerges from Callanan's work:

1) Aristophanes categorised three genders and used – for the first documented time – the word οὐδέτερον for neuter (pp. 35–41): the evidence of Herennius Philo's lexicon *De diversis verborum significationibus* (81 Palmieri = fr. 369 Sl.) is decisive on this point, since there we find the

113 Callanan 1987, 22–23.

114 Callanan 1987, 26–31.

115 This fragment is also of critical importance for the Aristophanic doctrine of analogy: see *infra*, 49 and n. 125.

116 Callanan 1987, 31–32.

117 Aristophanes seems to have treated nouns and adjectives as a single μέρος τῆς λέξεως (Callanan 1987, 33–34): for this aspect of ancient linguistic theory, see *supra*, 33. We know very little about his knowledge of the construction of comparatives and superlatives: fr. 347 Sl. (see just above) rather addresses matters of prosody, while Eust. *ad Od.* 1441.18 (p. 175 Sl.) simply attests the Aristophanic reading φιλοκτεανέστατε (in place of φιλοκτεανώτατε) at *Il.* 1.122, on the basis of which it is difficult to draw conclusions (Callanan 1987, 50; see also Nauck 1848, 46 and Slater 1986, 175).

terms ἄρσεν, θῆλυ and οὐδέτερον. Various other cases document attempts by Aristophanes to determine the correct gender of a word, especially in the context of his critical work on the poems of Homer;

2) he knew of various types of nominal derivation, even if he cannot be credited with devising a system in this respect (pp. 42–50): according to Eust. *ad Il.* 777.58–60 (cf. fr. 241 Sl.; the idea that the material in this passage dates back to Aristophanes belonged to Nauck 1848, p. 153), Aristophanes had a notion of “original” and “derived” nouns, though we cannot determine whether he actually called them πρωτόθετον and παράγωγον;

3) he knew of three numbers for nouns, even if we can only guess that he used the terms ἐνικόν, πληθυντικόν and δυικόν for these (pp. 50–56): it is here that the questions of agreement posed by Aristophanes should also be located (e.g. *sch.* Did. *Il.* 10.349a [p. 180 Sl.], *sch.* Did. *Il.* 15.301a [p. 186 Sl.], *sch.* Od. 6.74 [p. 198 Sl.] and 11.174 [p. 199 Sl.]), although what is admittedly at stake here is the relationship between *vox* and *res*, rather than real grammatical agreement: this is recognised only in *sch.* Od. 2.45 (p. 193 Sl.) where the grammarian read κακά in place of κακόν so as to construe it with δοιά at l. 46, a term which others, such as Aristarchus, explained as adverbial (τὸ δοιά ἀντὶ τοῦ διχῶς). The treatment of problems relating to the Homeric use of the dual is attested both by the number of times that Aristophanes read a dual instead of a plural in instances when the text was referring to two people or objects (*sch.* Did. *Il.* 6.121 [p. 178 Sl.], 8.290c [p. 179 Sl.], 10.4b [p. 179 Sl.], 11.103a [p. 181 Sl.], 11.135 [p. 181 Sl.], 12.127–138a [p. 182 Sl.], 13.613b [p. 184 Sl.], 17.721 [p. 188 Sl.], 18.526c [p. 188 Sl.]), and by the passage from which we infer that Aristophanes did not allow second and third person dual verb forms to be switched in secondary tenses (*sch.* Did. *Il.* 13.613b [p. 184 Sl.]);

4) he had an idea of the regularity of declension (pp. 57–61), as can be deduced from the explanation that he gave for the origin of the heteroclitic dative γερόντοισι (Eust. *ad Il.* 279.38–42 [fr. 25 Sl.]), in which we are able to glimpse his conviction that nominatives of the same type are inflected in the same way: Aristophanes in fact maintained that the Aetolians had confused the genitive (γενική) γέροντος with a nominative (εὐθεῖα) of –ο declension, and on this basis had constructed the erroneous dative plural γερόντοισι. In addition to the previously cited εὐθεῖα and γενική [πτώσεις], Aristophanes should moreover have been aware of the case known as κλητική (see Eust. *ad Il.* 1118.8 [fr. 241 Sl.]) and likely also of the δοτική and αἰτιατική cases (as Callanan 1987, 61, inferred, also considering the fact that these cases never received other technical names).

The material is not as extensive for the verb as it is for the noun, but does still allow for some observations:

1) Aristophanes examined irregular forms. This may be inferred from two of the notes in the Λέξεις (pp. 62–64) which, because they assemble several examples of the same phenomenon, appear to imply a sort of theoretical framework for verbal inflection and which seem not to be motivated by the empirical aim of determining or explaining the text of a literary

work: fr. 19 Sl. (Eust. *ad Od.* 1761.30-31 and ms. M) attests that Aristophanes registered the use of the ending -σαν for some imperfects (ἐσχάζοσαν, ἐλέγοσαν and ἐφεύγοσαν), believing it to be a Chalcidian feature, while Eust. *ad Od.* 1761.38 (fr. 28 Sl.) attests his recording of the imperative forms ἀπόστα and κατάβα with their respective “regular” forms ἀπόστηθι and κατάβηθι;

2) he was aware of the rules of contraction (p. 65), as can be deduced from *sch. Od.* 2.50 (p. 193 Sl.), which cites Aristophanes for the form ἐπέχρων in place of ἐπέχραον, and *sch. E. Or.* 1287 (fr. 389 Sl.), where the grammarian is mentioned for his reading ἐκκεκώφονται in place of ἐκκεκώφηται, which implies a contract -ο stem;

3) he had a stance on the construction and use of verb forms in the Homeric poems, as well as on the augment’s presence or absence in historic tenses (pp. 66-71). Examples of textual constitution based on the interaction between Aristophanes’ research in *Homerics* and linguistic methods include: *sch. Did. Il.* 1.298c (p. 175 Sl.) for the future form μαχήσομαι, *sch. Did. Il.* 3.57a (p. 177 Sl.) for the pluperfect ἔσσο, with -σ- (for the determination of this form the scholion attests, without referring it to Aristophanes, the use of an analogy with the future ἔσσω at *Od.* 16.79 and the aorist ἔσσεας at *Od.* 14.396) and *sch. Od.* 14.522 (p. 201 Sl.) for the infinitive εἵνυσθαι (in place of ἔννυσθαι), on the basis of comparison with καταεἵνυσον at *Il.* 23.135. A couple of cases document his awareness of a relationship between morphology and semantics when it came to the use of verb forms in Homer: *sch. Did. Il.* 13.51a (p. 183 Sl.), where Aristophanes’ position in favour of σχήσουσιν in place of ἔξουσιν is recorded, with mention of the parallel at *Il.* 13.151 (what led Callanan to argue that the grammarian understood the different semantics of the two future forms of ἔχω, where σχήσειν signified to “restrain”, “check”, certainly its meaning at *Il.* 13.151); and Eust. *ad Od.* 1680.23ff. (fr. 22 Sl.), where Aristophanes notices that in Attic a single form has two functions, while Homer uses a morphologically different form for every semantic function (ἴσθι in place of γίνωσκε, ἔσο in place of ὑπαρχε). As to the augment, Callanan highlighted the following fragments: *sch. Did. Il.* 11.686b (p. 182 Sl.: χρεῖος ὀφείλετο in place of χρέως ὀφείλετο), 17.234a (p. 188 Sl.: ἔλπετο with initial ε, instead of η), 15.601a (p. 187 Sl.: μέλλε in place of ἔμελλε, «Ionically»: here however it is possible to read Aristarchus’ name rather than Aristophanes’: see Erbse’s apparatus *ad loc.*);

4) he may have had (though this is a mere hypothesis) an idea of the durative character of the imperfect as compared with the aorist (p. 72). In reality, the available evidence only gives vague indications which do not allow us to draw a clear conclusion on this point: at *Il.* 13.443, Aristophanes read πελέμιζεν in place of πελέμιξεν (*sch. Did. Il.* 13.443b, p. 183 Sl.), while at 20.306 he preferred ἤχθαιρε to ἤχθηρε (*sch. Did. Il.* 20.306b, p. 189 Sl.), but the reasons for his choices are not transmitted. There also exist other examples of Aristophanes’ textual interventions when it came to variants based on verb tenses, but according to Callanan these are owed to the

demands of exegesis rather than to his knowledge of the theory of tenses: *sch. Did. Il.* 2.436a, p. 176 Sl.: ἐγγυαλίζει instead of ἐγγυαλίζει; 14.474a, p. 186 Sl.: ἔοικεν in place of ἔφκει; and 19.86, p. 189 Sl.: νεικ<ε>ίουσιν for νεικείεσκον;

5) he knew of moods, even if it is impossible to tell whether he developed any theories about them (pp. 73–74). In this case as well, the tradition preserves no remark made by Aristophanes which is unrelated to textual information: at *Od.* 5.168 (*sch. ad loc.*, p. 197 Sl.) Aristophanes preferred the optative ἴκοιο to the subjunctive ἴκηαι, just as at *Od.* 14.328 (*sch. ad loc.*, p. 201 Sl.) he opted for ἐπακούσαι instead of the ἐπακούσῃ defended by Aristarchus; at *Il.* 17.264 (*sch. Did. Il.* 17.264b, p. 188 Sl.) he chose the subjunctive βεβρύχη, which is more common in the tradition than the indicative βέβρυχεν: exactly what motivations guided these choices and whether those motivations can be traced back to a general speculative framework were, for Callanan, questions destined to remain open.

An Aristophanic text which Callanan perhaps did not emphasise enough from this perspective is A.D. *Synt.*, in GG II/II 443.7–13 (fr. 382 Sl.), from which we learn that Aristophanes considered ἀναστροφή a defining characteristic of prepositions: the fragment was indeed included in the section on accents – since it discusses the Aeolic *barytonesis*, i.e. recessive accentuation. A separate discussion, however, would have underscored its status as a witness to a notion about a part of speech¹¹⁸, without however implying the unwarranted conclusion, rightly rejected by Callanan, that Aristophanes elaborated, or was even aware of, a doctrine concerning the ἴδια of the parts of speech¹¹⁹.

When it came to the formal description of language, Callanan identified a more substantial contribution by Aristophanes in the area of semantics, the field of study to which his collection of Λέξεις belongs¹²⁰. Callanan investigated the nature and purpose of this work, eventually rejecting Pfeiffer's thesis that Aristophanes had taken a diachronic approach to the description of language¹²¹. On the other hand, it turns out that Aristo-

118 Callanan 1987, 28–30. See also Ax 1991, 279; Schenkeveld 1994, 275; Lallot 1997, II 286–287; Matthaios 1999, 588 and 608; Matthaios 2010c.

119 Callanan 1987, 30.

120 Callanan 1987, 75–96.

121 Callanan 1987, 75–82. For Pfeiffer's position see *supra*, n. 81. Even if Callanan's disagreement with Pfeiffer's conjectures of a structural, chronological subdivision into two groups of words and a primarily historical-linguistic purpose of the beginning section of the Λέξεις is understandable, his rigorous denial of the diachronic aspects in both the Λέξεις and ancient linguistic theory in general seems excessive (see also Ax 1990, 14–15, who recognised among other things that various Homeric scholia indicate that Alexandrian philology had an awareness of diachrony [15 and n. 39]).

phanes rarely made recourse to etymology¹²², and when he did so it was usually to clarify rare or obsolete expressions, often Homeric ones, or glosses in the strict sense; he also used etymology to argue for certain forms and orthographies¹²³, though without going so far as to establish general rules¹²⁴.

Callanan illustrated the recourse made to etymology in order to explain unusual words with the cases of δμῶες and δμωίδες (mss. M and L, *s.v.*, fr. 322–324 Sl.), οἰκότριβες (mss. M and L, *s.v.*; Eust. *ad Il.* 1327.22–23, fr. 328 Sl.), κεράδες (Eusth. *ad Od.* 1625.45, fr. 162 Sl.), πτώξ, δασύπους, ταχίνας (ms. M, *s.v.* λαγώς, fr. 188–190 Sl.), βόας (Ath. 7.287a, fr. 409 Sl.), μασχαλίσματα (Phot. μ 249, 19, *s.v.*, *Sud.* μ 275, *s.v.*, fr. 412 Sl.), τρίγλη (Artemid. 2.14, fr. 377 Sl.). For clarification of glosses he adduced the examples of: τηλύγετος (ms. M, *s.v.*, fr. 234 Sl.), μολοβρός (Eust. *ad Od.* 1817.19–23, fr. 197 Sl.); and for the determination of forms and orthography he cited (pp. 23–25): ἄαπτος / ἄεπτος (*sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 1.567b, fr. 418 Sl.), εἰσίθυμη / εἰσίθυμη (*sch.* *Od.* 6.264, p. 198 Sl.), πῆξε / πτῆξε (*sch.* Did. *Il.* 14.40b, p. 184 Sl.), παράνυμφος / παρανύμφιος (ms. P, *s.v.*, Eust. *ad Il.* 652.41ff., fr. 280–284 Sl.: see *supra*, 45).

Finally, Callanan dedicated an elaborate discussion to the analogical method that is discernable in Aristophanic fragments (pp. 107–122), identifying within these the use of four-term proportion and the development of a catalogue of conditions of analogy, though no set of rules for inflection, nor any normative purpose.

The principal evidence cited by Callanan for four-term proportion (pp. 115–119) is *sch.* Hdn. *Il.* 15.606b (p. 187 Sl.: see *supra*, 45), in which he retained the reading Ἀριστοφάνης against Erbse's conjecture (1960, 401–402) Ἀρίσταρχος. He moreover presented (pp. 119–121) a series of references by Aristophanes to similarities or analogies between expressions, formulated without any formal structure and introduced simply by terms such as ὥς, ὥσπερ, οὕτως.

For Aristophanes, the conditions which allowed for the insertion of words into analogical relationships¹²⁵ (pp. 57–58) were coincidences of gender, case, ending, number of syllables, and accent; to these Aristarchus

122 Callanan 1987, 97–102, in particular 97; see also Nauck 1848, 268–269; Pfeiffer 1968, 201 with n. 4, 260; Slater 1986, 19.

123 Callanan 1987, 99–102.

124 Callanan 1987, 97–98; the idea that Aristophanes developed etymological rules was upheld by Reitzenstein 1897, 184, perhaps on the basis of the evidence of Varro (*ling.* 6.2, fr. 372 Sl.), who seems to attribute to Aristophanes a theory of κλίσις in an etymological context: see also Slater 1986, 138; Schenkeveld 1990b, 297–298.

125 For the types of analogical relationships, see *supra*, n. 44.

added the prohibition against comparing simple with compound words (Char. *gramm.* 149, 26ff. = fr. 375 Sl.: «huic [*scil.* analogiae] Aristophanes quinque rationes dedit vel ut alii putant, sex: primo, ut eiusdem sint generis de quibus quaeritur, dein casus, tum exitus, quarto numeri syllabarum, item soni. Sextum Aristarchus, discipulus eius, illud addidit ne umquam simplicia compositis aptemus». Nauck 1848, 269–270, emended the text of Charisius, attributing to Aristophanes another condition of analogy: he inserted *quinto* between *numeri* and *syllabarum* and corrected *sextum* to *sexto*, which he read at the end of the sentence, thus modifying the punctuation: «fourth, [words] having the same number; fifth, having the same number of syllables, and likewise sixth, having the same accent»)¹²⁶.

Callanan proceeded with extreme caution in inducing from this documentation Aristophanes' premises, methods and objectives of linguistic analysis¹²⁷: he credited Aristophanes with a rich and advanced knowledge of grammar, though one which operated according to a pragmatic approach. This approach was guided by evidence and usage rather than by theories or presumed laws, and was for the most part based on description as well as upon an understanding of language derived from empirical observation, and was often aimed at Homeric textual criticism: within such a framework, elaboration of a developed abstract system would have been inconceivable¹²⁸. Nevertheless, Callanan identified at

126 This evidence was called into question by Steinthal 1890–1891², II 81 n.; on the subject see also Barwick 1922, 179ff.; Fehling 1956, 240–250; Siebenborn 1976, 72ff. and Ax 1982, 98 n. 8. The identification of the conditions of analogy was a much-debated issue in Greek and Roman antiquity: according to Varro (*ling.* 10.8–10), Parmeniscus fixed them at eight (so also Caesar [fr. 11 Funaioli] and perhaps Varro [*ling.* 10.21–26; see also Fehling 1956, 248–249 and nn. 1 and 2; 1957, 74–75 for the interpretative difficulties of this passage]), Dionysius of Sidon at 71, and Aristocles at 14. Reconstructing Herodian's position in this respect (in GG III/II 634, 5–8) is difficult (see Colson 1919, 28 and n. 4; Fehling 1956, 246 and n. 2; Siebenborn 1976, 73).

127 The indirect tradition poses clear obstacles to this type of reconstruction: it is indeed difficult to establish whether the transmitted terminology is original or is owed to some intermediary (all the more so given that the introduction of specialised grammatical concepts seems to have been one of the most frequent types of interpolation introduced into the works of the earliest Alexandrians: Callanan 1987, 37). Moreover, the fact that the scholia merely cite an Aristophanic reading but fail to provide the reasons for that reading often renders unrealistic any attempt at grasping any general theoretical background that may lay behind it (pp. 51, 62, *al.*).

128 It is possible to reconstruct this synopsis from Callanan's scattered observations: see e.g. pp. 27, 30, 38, 40, 43, 72, 74, 122. The absence from Callanan's monograph of an overview, in addition to the caution of his argumentation has led to varied critical receptions of his thought: e.g. Janko 1995a, 214 n. 1 wrote

least a few cases in which Aristophanes did not limit himself to practical and analytical work, but also extracted general rules and theoretical constructs (see *e.g.* his discussion in general terms of questions of prosody [p. 32], his use of practical observations on the genders of nouns as preliminary work for further researches [p. 40], and his discussions of the verb on the basis of his theoretical knowledge of inflection, which were intended to lead to the creation or application of abstract categories or structures [p. 64]). On the other hand he also de-emphasised Aristophanes' image as an "advocate of analogy" in polemical contrast with the supporters of anomaly, an image that Callanan rejected as unfounded¹²⁹: he rather saw Aristophanes as a neutral observer of language, who was descriptive and never prescriptive (pp. 103–106 and *passim*), and who recognised and accepted anomalies in the doctrine of word construction without claiming to regulate them in the manner of the analogists (pp. 110–112)¹³⁰.

With reference to this last point, Ax (1990) has called attention to a piece of evidence that is found in Varro and not considered by Callanan and which presents Aristophanes as an innovator, at least in some cases, of the old linguistic *consuetudo* on the basis of the rules of analogy¹³¹: this

that «Callanan ... goes too far in denying that Aristophanes had a grammatical system», while according to Matthaios 1999, 22, Callanan did indeed, though with every caution, credit him with such a system («... einen Sprachbeschreibungssystem, d.h. ein System grammatischer Regeln und Begriffe ... Das Vorhandensein eines solchen Systems hat Callanan für Aristophanes von Byzanz, wenn auch mit aller Vorsicht, angenommen»).

129 See Callanan 1987, 97–122.

130 Some useful correctives to the use of analogy in Aristophanes have been introduced by Schenkeveld 1990b, 290–297, who has lucidly posed the question in these terms: how much awareness of linguistic categories is necessary for applying an analogical method in a philological discussion? That is, what are the assumptions of this method? Schenkeveld demonstrates, also thanks to the so-called *Donatiani Fragmentum* (in *GL VI* 275.13–276.9), not considered by Callanan, that Aristophanes must have had both an awareness of regularities in language and a tendency towards abstraction on the basis of accidental observations and, ultimately, that he was able to make use of grammatical classifications to a greater extent than Callanan recognised.

131 Varro *ling.* 9.12 = fr. 374 Sl. («... artufices egregii non reprehendundi, quod consuetudinem ... superiorum non sunt secuti, Aristophanes improbandus, qui potius in quibusdam veritatem [veteritatem codd.] quam consuetudinem secutus?»). The passage contains textual uncertainties discussed by Ax 1990, 7–11, on the basis of a parallel with Cic. *orat.* 155–162 (which contains an overview of interventions made by the analogists of Cicero's era on the numerous variants of *consuetudo*). The testimonium's meaning is, however, accepted as beyond doubt.

would imply that Aristophanes both was aware of the diachronic development of language and used analogy to make prescriptive interventions on contemporary language, in sharp contrast with the interpretation suggested by Callanan's data. Ax hypothetically explained such a contradiction between the testimony found in Varro and the rest of the documentation as resulting from the chance nature of the tradition, which may have done away with other fragments that would have helped to clarify the picture. He moreover demonstrated prudent scepticism when it came to the idea that Aristophanes abstained from applying his own knowledge in the field of analogy (indicated by fr. 373 and 375 Sl. too¹³²) also to the regulation of doubtful cases of *consuetudo*¹³³.

An overview of the contribution of Hellenistic philology to grammatical science was offered by Ax in 1991, with a summary of the known evidence and principal positions taken by scholars in this area. In the case of Aristophanes of Byzantium Ax concluded that, although his conceptual and terminological contributions are only vaguely detectable, he must have already had a notable grasp of morphology. While it is certainly true that he never composed something like a compendium of the parts of speech, he did concern himself with problems related to the linguistic rules of etymology and analogy and used these rules in his role as both textual critic and "guardian" of language; it cannot however be determined whether he joined in the controversy between anomaly and analogy¹³⁴. In Aristarchus, on the other hand, Ax saw the first clear indications of the μέρος τεχνικόν becoming autonomous, although he recognised that Aristarchus' grammatical competences functioned first and foremost as an aid to his philological aims. According to Ax, in fact, Aristarchus had a highly developed descriptive apparatus of language, especially of morphology, at his disposal and began to shape the Alexandrian system of the eight parts of speech and their accidentia, even if he was not yet able to rely upon a set of rules governing inflection. In his observations about language Aristarchus had not only descriptive, but also prescriptive, objectives, and to these ends above all applied the principle of analogy. Taken as a whole, his contribution to the development

132 These are, respectively, Varro *ling.* 10.42.47, where it is said that Aristophanes and others wrote about "perfect" analogies (where the compared words are also similar in terms of meaning), such as *bonus : malus = boni : mali* («tertium genus [*scil.* analogiae] est illud duplex quod dixi, in quo et res et voces similiter proportionem dicuntur, ut bonus malus, boni mali, de quorum analogia et Aristophanes et alii scripserunt»); and the fragment on the conditions of analogy (for which see *supra*, 49–50).

133 See Ax 1990, 17.

134 Ax 1991, 277–282.

of Hellenistic grammar should therefore be judged, in Ax's opinion, as extraordinarily significant¹³⁵. Ax also considers Crates of Mallus briefly for his definition of στοιχεῖον (whose original context is unknown), which goes something like this: the element is the smallest part of φωνή, and this functions in relation to the entire system of ἐγγράμματος φωνή¹³⁶. This definition presumes an awareness of the meaning of φωνή, in addition to, if the attribution of the second part of the fragment is correct¹³⁷, the Stoic distinction between ἐγγράμματος and ἀγράμματος φωνή, perhaps as well as the subdivision of written language into the sequence στοιχεῖον, συλλαβή, λέξις, λόγος. This conceptual background led Mette to compare the thin testimonium for Crates with the content of systematic treatises on the parts of speech such as the *Techne* of Diogenes of Babylon and the one ascribed to Dionysius Thrax¹³⁸. A parallel to the text in question is furthermore recognisable in a papyrus fragment of a grammar (*POsl.* 13, col. I, 9-10: fr. 95 Broggiato, in the apparatus). The hypothesis that the definition of στοιχεῖον appeared in a work dedicated to the doctrine of φωνή and to its constituent parts, were it able to be substantiated, would contribute evidence in favour of the "Stoic-Pergamene *techne*" postulated by Barwick¹³⁹. Nevertheless, the transmitted data are not sufficient to support the idea¹⁴⁰: in fact, an entirely different context for this fragment, namely Crates' work on poetics, has been proposed on the basis of Philodemus' reference to Crates' theories concerning στοιχεῖα, upon which «he claims judgments of good poetic works are founded» (*PHerc.* 1425 and *PHerc.* 1538, col. XXIX, 7-15 = fr. 101b Broggiato)¹⁴¹. Finally, Ax's

135 Ax 1991, 282-288.

136 *Sch. Marc.* D.T., in GG I/III 316.24 (fr. 52 Mette = 95 Broggiato): ὁρίζεται δὲ τὸ στοιχεῖον ὁ μὲν Κράτης οὕτω, φωνῆς μέρος {τὸ} ἐλάχιστον· μέρος ἐλάχιστον εἶπεν ὡς πρὸς τὸ ὅλον σύστημα τῆς ἐγγραμμάτου φωνῆς ...; Aristotle's definition and another four anonyms follow. The words μέρος ἐλάχιστον εἶπεν - φωνῆς, reported by the two mss. of the *Scholia Marciana* (V and N) after the citation of Aristotle have been transposed to the end of the Cratetean fragment by Hilgard, a transposition accepted by Crates' editors. The passage is discussed by Ax 1991, 288-289; see also Mette 1952, 5-6 and 67-68 (who also removed the expression τῆς κατὰ σύνταξιν from Aristotle's definition so as to put it at the end of the citation of Crates; *contra* Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], 251); Ax 1986, 218-223; Janko 2000, 123-124 n. 6; Broggiato 2001 (= 2006), XXXVI and 250-253.

137 See the preceding note.

138 Mette 1952, 2-6.

139 See *supra*, 28.

140 See Ax 1986, 223; 1991, 289; Broggiato 2001 (= 2006), 253.

141 Broggiato 2001 (= 2006), 252-253, with bibliography.

study sought to reconstruct the arguments of the debate between Crates' approach to the defence of anomaly (that is, the principle of inflectional irregularity, with the resulting assumption that linguistic usage constitutes a normative criterion) and Aristarchean analogy (which established regularity as a rule in the process of derivation). Ax saw no reason to doubt the existence of this conflict of ideas as to how language worked¹⁴², though he declared himself uncertain as to its actual magnitude and influence in the ancient world. According to him, the problem of analogy must not have been a purely academic matter of marginal importance, but could have been a question that arose from attempts to establish the correct texts of the classics and the ever-growing need for regulating language. That need concerned not only the limited field of philology, but also the world of education, with important repercussions for rhetoric as well – in short, this was high-profile debate that swept through all levels of the educational system and in which the most important figures of the age had participated¹⁴³.

The same years saw the publication of other overviews of the subject. D. J. Taylor (1987) had read into the positions of scholars such as Di Benedetto, Pinborg, Siebenborn, Frede, and Fehling (1979) a new interpretative model of the history of ancient linguistics, with which he agreed¹⁴⁴. This model no longer treated grammar as the result of a series of cumulative acquisitions¹⁴⁵; it also eliminated the analogy/anomaly debate¹⁴⁶ and avoided creating an explicit dichotomy between technical and philosophical grammar. As to the Alexandrian scholars, they possessed, for Taylor, only a few grammatical ideas and did not always have known how to manage them or what to do with them: their work was exclusively philological, and the remarks on analogy attested for Aristophanes and Aristarchus should be interpreted strictly in this context and not in relation to any putative knowledge of the rules of declension, inflection, paradigms and similes – an idea which, in Taylor's opinion,

142 This was contested by Fehling 1956, 264–270 (see *supra*, n. 46, with bibliography).

143 Ax 1991, 289–295.

144 Taylor 1987, who nevertheless recognised (see in particular p. 16) that the new model was not yet finalised and warned of the necessity of constructing a more structured and distinct architecture for it before trusting in its ability to compete successfully with the traditional model that it was intended to replace.

145 See in particular Taylor 1987, 4–6 and 13.

146 The history of scholarship on the subject is traced by Taylor 1987, 6–8 (see immediately *supra* and n. 46).

ought to be entirely rejected¹⁴⁷. Thus, for Taylor, in this phase grammar had not yet emerged as an independent field of study, something which would not take place until the 1st century B.C.¹⁴⁸

The account of the *status quaestionis* outlined by D. M. Schenkeveld (1990b) was avowedly a continuation of Taylor's work. In it Schenkeveld made a number of useful observations, particularly about Ax's study of ancient ideas about φωνή and its connections to the concept of language (1986)¹⁴⁹ and Callanan's research on the linguistic fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium (1987)¹⁵⁰. Schenkeveld's careful analysis of Ax's findings raised doubts as to the plausibility of a bipartite model of exposition περὶ φωνῆς within the Greek and Roman grammatical tradition; he also introduced a substantial corrective to Callanan's results by establishing with greater certainty that Aristophanes had made use of grammatical classifications.

Later, Schenkeveld (1994) sketched a picture of the *technē grammatikē's* relationship with Alexandrian philology, addressing the role of the handbook attributed to Dionysius Thrax¹⁵¹, the doctrine of the parts of speech, the theory of *hellenismos*, and the question of syntax¹⁵². He highlighted how Aristophanes and Aristarchus had made a number of strictly grammatical observations and had at their disposal a considerable apparatus of linguistic distinctions thanks to their drawing upon Stoic categories and to their transformation of these into grammatical word-

147 Taylor 1987, 12-13. A similar position was rightly judged to be excessive by Matthaïos 1999, 31, who on the other hand also demonstrates the limits of Erbse's thesis, which ran to the other extreme (see *supra*, 40-42).

148 Taylor 1987, 11.

149 See *supra*, 44.

150 See *supra*, 44-51.

151 Schenkeveld 1994, 266-269, 291-292; he would later address the subject in greater detail (Schenkeveld 1998: see *supra*, n. 79).

152 This area of linguistic analysis was discussed by Schenkeveld, beginning with the systematic study devoted to it by Apollonius Dyscolus, before whom it seems to have received only minor attention (Schenkeveld 1994, 293-298). On the issue, which requires some conceptual distinctions, see recently Swiggers/Wouters 2003, as well as Matthaïos 2003 and 2004 for a restatement of the role of Trypho, whom some critics had wanted to see as a predecessor of Apollonius in this field. On the contrary, from Matthaïos' examination it becomes clear that Trypho's work implies theoretical discussion, however rudimentary, of syntactical data; nevertheless it does not demonstrate a developed analysis of the topic, to the extent that it fails to address the crucial questions of the correctness of constructions and of their linguistic components.

classes¹⁵³. In the beginning these tools were used primarily in the context of philological research and exegetical work, though Schenkeveld did not rule out that the earliest Alexandrians might have discussed, at least orally, some theoretical aspects of the grammatical ideas available to them, and may have made original contributions in this area¹⁵⁴. When it came to *hellenismos*, the conditions of analogy set by Aristophanes and Aristarchus cannot demonstrate, to Schenkeveld's mind, extensive awareness of paradigms or of an elaborate system of declension and conjugation, nor can they indicate the institution of a theory of κανόνες, as would later be the case. Rather, these conditions may permit a glimpse of initial attempts to compile lists of inflections¹⁵⁵. Given these premises, then, the first steps towards definition and description of the discipline have been taken by Dionysius Thrax, while genuine systematisation of grammar as a *technē* have only occurred in the next generation, with Asclepiades of Myrlea and above all Trypho¹⁵⁶.

An entirely different point of view was adopted by F. Ildefonse (1997) who, sharing Di Benedetto's interpretation¹⁵⁷, investigated the problem of grammar's first origins in antiquity by programmatically excluding from her study the philological approach of figures such as Aristophanes and Aristarchus¹⁵⁸. Their contribution to linguistic analysis, made before the great turning point (which she agreed with Di Benedetto to have taken place in the 1st century B.C.) was purely accidental, simply a means to a philological end and not an aim pursued for its own sake. Ildefonse's work therefore started from "philosophical"

153 Doubts persist as to the actual origins of the terminology attested by the sources for the parts of speech, which may be later (see however Matthaios 1999, 43–46), but it is highly likely that the distinctions, apart from their nomenclature, had already been made (Schenkeveld 1994, 276–278, 280). The Stoic influence becomes even more pronounced in the next generation (see *supra*, 33) with Dionysius Thrax and Apollodorus of Athens (Schenkeveld 1994, 280–281).

154 The fact that systematic technical treatises are not attested for the Alexandrians does not itself constitute sufficient grounds for refuting this hypothesis (Schenkeveld 1994, 278).

155 Schenkeveld 1994, 283–287.

156 Schenkeveld 1994, 278–281. These results are taken up again in Schenkeveld 1998, 46–47.

157 See *supra*, 31–34.

158 Ildefonse 1997, in particular 27. The study begins with an introduction to the concept of grammar in Greek antiquity, its relationship with philosophy, its various ancient definitions, and its nature and its constitutive parts; it also alludes to the problem of the late emergence of the discipline. Aristophanes and Aristarchus' contributions are summarised in the chapter on empirical *vs* technical approaches (pp. 20–23), but then explicitly set aside.

grammar (Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics) and came directly to the “technical” grammar of Apollonius Dyscolus, confining to an appendix a note on the *Techne* attributed to Dionysius, which she dated to a period later than Apollonius’. This sort of method, however, prevents us from viewing properly all of the factors which contributed to the development of theories of language, in that it obliterates an entire intermediate stage which a more patient investigation would reveal to have been of crucial importance¹⁵⁹.

New impetus in this direction arrived, under the auspices of W. Ax, from the work of S. Matthaios (1999), who gathered and examined all of the texts of the Aristarchean tradition having to do with the doctrine of the parts of speech: a limited selection but one of vital importance for ancient grammatical theory¹⁶⁰. For the first time, a study of Aristarchus did not advance on the basis of a limited sampling, but instead proposed a reconstruction based on an ordered and exhaustive collection of evidence in order to establish Aristarchus’ position and role in the development of ancient linguistic science¹⁶¹. This extensive study allowed for

159 See the reservations expressed by Schenkeveld 1999 and Matthaios 2002, 165 n. 16.

160 Matthaios 1999. The number of passages relevant to Aristarchus’ approach to language as a whole amounts to about 5,000. A half of these concerns the doctrine of parts of speech and only this group has consequently been taken into consideration by Matthaios: roughly a third has been analysed in detail in the theoretical section and 225 pieces have been registered as fragments (in the text Matthaios prints the passages which are most important and most certainly traceable to Aristarchus’ own formulations, whereas other *loci similes* of Aristarchean origin are referred to in the apparatus of the testimonia) (Matthaios 1999, 33, 59ff.). The sources consist in the scholia to Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and Apollonius of Rhodes; the lexicon of Apollonius Sophistes; and in the writings of Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, Priscian, Maximus Planudes, Charisius-Donatian, Varro, and Quintilian (pp. 36–59). The risks posed by the indirect tradition, especially when it comes to terminology, are well highlighted, even if trust is placed in the credibility of Aristonicus (pp. 43–48): Aristarchus’ knowledge in the field of grammar can in fact be gleaned from his application of linguistic ideas to textual criticism, though we cannot be sure of accurately recovering his theoretical premises, nor that Aristarchus moved from empirical observation to theoretical description of grammatical phenomena; potential conclusions are also restricted by the chance nature of this material’s selection in the course of transmission (pp. 33–36).

161 The material is arranged by content according to a structure that reproduces the eight parts of speech, knowledge of which is attributed to Aristarchus by a passage of Quintilian that has been debated (*inst.* 1.4.17 = fr. 1 M., see immediately below): noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, adverb, conjunction, and preposition.

confirmation of Quintilian's account of Aristarchus' knowledge of the eight parts of speech¹⁶², as well as for the attribution to Aristarchus of a conceptual apparatus of linguistic description involving a certain degree of abstraction, differentiation, and systematisation of grammatical doctrine. Since it is neither possible nor necessary to retrace in detail the entire set of evidence analysed by Matthaïos, here I shall discuss only a few of the most important results that he achieved¹⁶³.

In the case of nouns (fr. 1–53 M.) we find investigations of ὄνομα as the technical term for proper names, common nouns, and adjectives¹⁶⁴, as well as of the opposition between ἰδίως and κοινῶς λεγόμενον, and the categories κύριον ὄνομα, προσηγορία and ἐπίθετον; for semantics there are discussions of homonymy, synonymy, nouns of genus and species, collective nouns, nouns characterised by an ἔννοια περιεκτική, and nouns with active meaning (δραστική ἔννοια); for constructions Matthaïos examines fragments relating to composition, derivation, patronymics, denominatives, and comparative forms of adjectives; regarding case there are discussions of declension and examples of case-switching. As to verbs (fr. 54–93 M.), observations emerge regarding diathesis, with particular attention to the middle voice, of which Aristarchus must have known something¹⁶⁵, as well as instances of passives in place of actives and vice versa. For tenses there are fragments on the oppositions present/future, present/past, and imperfect/aorist (παρτατικὸς [*scil.* χρόνος] / συντελικόν [*scil.* ῥῆμα / σχῆμα]) and on the tenses of participles and infinitives; as to moods, Aristarchus must have been aware of the infinitive and imperative, of the optative and its use, and of the subjunctive and indicative. About number we hear of the use of the dual in Homer, agreement of subject and predicate (plural verb with plural neuter subject, constructions «according to sense» [σχῆμα πρὸς

162 The evidence's reliability has often been doubted, and the introduction of the eight-part system of speech has been assigned to Trypho's generation. An account of the question can be found in Matthaïos 1999, 191–198. Aristarchus' tradition is viewed as concluding the processes of formation and expansion of the grammatical system of parts of speech, signs of which are already evident in Aristophanes of Byzantium (pp. 621–622).

163 Pontani 2002b presents a series of observations on and proposals for improvement regarding individual points, especially when it comes to readings of the scholia to the *Odyssey*, as well as the suggestion that some statements might be mitigated (e.g. that regarding the presence of «eine Tendenz zur grammatischen Abstraktion und Normierung» with respect to conjugations, p. 410). These are admittedly remarks on individual points, and are not intended to invalidate the importance of the work overall.

164 On which see the clarification of Pontani 2002b, 149–150 as to the correct textual arrangement of *sch. Od.* 4.221 [fr. 4 M.], which would eliminate the attestation of the use of ὄνομα for adjectives.

165 Pace Steinthal 1890–1891², II 106.

τὸ νοητόν], Ἀλκμανικὸν σχῆμα [in a sentence with two subjects, the verb occurs after the first but in number conforms to both, in either a plural or dual form], Πινδαρικὸν σχῆμα [in a sentence with a plural masculine or feminine subject the verb is singular], and interchanges between one number and another). Aristarchus' concepts of πρόσωπον for grammatical person and συζυγία for conjugations are also reconstructed. As to the participle (fr. 94–95 M.), Aristarchus was as far as we know the first to isolate it as a distinct part of speech, which he called μετοχή. With regards to articles and pronouns (fr. 96–135 M.), Aristarchus is also responsible for the most ancient known attestation of the term ἄρθρον for the article (a category divided into ἄρθρα προτακτικά, i.e. ὁ, ἡ, τό, and ἄρθρα ὑποτακτικά, i.e. ὅς, ἥ, ὅ) and the definition of pronouns, which Aristarchus probably called ἀντωνυμιαί, such as λέξεις κατὰ πρόσωπα σύζυγοι. Intense work on this last part of speech is also documented: there are notes on agreement of person in personal and possessive pronouns, the coinage of the term ἐπιταγματική (*scil.* ἀντωνυμία?) for αὐτός used in conjunction with the tonic forms of personal and possessive pronouns, and observations on personal and reflexive pronouns as well as on personal and possessive ones. For adverbs (fr. 136–167 M.) there is a collection of morphological, syntactic, and semantic observations, with discussion of this part of speech's history and its designation as μεσότης. There are no attested theoretical comments about conjunctions (fr. 168–178 M.) and prepositions (fr. 179–225 M.), but only observations regarding Homeric usage (on the subjects of coordinating, causal, and expletive conjunctions; on the interchanging of prepositions and adverbs, the interchanging of prepositions amongst themselves, as well as prepositions' omission, pleonastic use, government, and accentuation), in addition to the respective appellations σύνδεσμος and πρόθεσις.

Among the doctrine's theoretical components it is possible to identify on the one hand Stoic thought (relating to verb tenses, the concept of case, the term μεσότης for the adverb)¹⁶⁶, and on the other the Aristotelian-Peripatetic tradition (the conception of the noun and its internal divisions, the theory of the pronoun, and the concept of grammatical person), which here is counted as significant even though it had previously been little considered¹⁶⁷. Furthermore, various affinities with the contents of the *Techne* allow us to recognise the antiquity, at least in some places, of the grammatical theory crystallised in the latter¹⁶⁸. Matthaïos' conclusion is that the work of Aristarchus and his contemporaries

166 Though also relevant are the departures from the Stoic approach, e.g. the conception of the nature of the article and of the relationship between proper and appellative names. See the previous page and *infra*, n. 173.

167 Matthaïos 1999, 623–625; see *supra*, n. 25.

168 Matthaïos 1999, 265, 282–283, 623; see also Matthaïos' position in 2009, mentioned *supra*, n. 76.

laid the essential foundations which made later technical elaborations of linguistic science possible: Aristarchus had indeed taken part in the contemporary debate about language, participated in the process of “grammaticising” philosophical and rhetorical-literary concepts, and coined new linguistic categories¹⁶⁹. The primacy of his philological/exegetical work is by no means denied; rather this area is upheld as the one in which the first Alexandrians exercised the apparatus of linguistic description, i.e. the system of grammatical rules and concepts, at their disposal¹⁷⁰.

On the basis of these results Matthaios has developed, in the course of the last decade, a broader view of Hellenistic approaches to linguistic phenomena. In the first place he presents a comprehensive synopsis of the history of the system of parts of speech from its first origins to its reception in the Roman world and demonstrates that Aristarchus, as well as his predecessors and contemporaries, played a decisive role in the development of this theory¹⁷¹. The evidence that he has gathered allows us to see that the Aristotelian-Peripatetic tradition had a conspicuous effect on Alexandrian description of language; it also allows us to hypothesise, in contrast with the traditional theory of a linear evolution (Plato-Aristotle → Stoa → Alexandrians), as to parallel developments of Alexandrian philology and philosophy, especially Stoicism, which in some cases exerted mutual influence upon each other¹⁷². The influence of the Stoic doctrine intensified in the generation following Aristarchus,

169 Matthaios 1999, 625.

170 Matthaios 1999, 21-22.

171 Matthaios 2001 (= 2005) and 2002. Matthaios sees the dawn of this process as having occurred in the generation before Aristarchus: Aristophanes of Byzantium spoke of prepositions as an independent category (see *supra*, 48), and the concept of ἀντωνυμία for pronouns must have been in existence before Comanus (an older contemporary of Aristarchus), who proposed to replace it with ἀντωνομασία; the nature of the participle was investigated by both Comanus himself and Callistratus (Matthaios 2001 [= 2005], 69-71; 2002, 166-168).

172 Matthaios 2001 (= 2005), 80-83; 2002, 188-191. For traces of Aristotle's influence, see immediately above and Matthaios 2001 (= 2005), 73-76. Matthaios bases this theory of parallel development primarily upon the history of the consideration of prepositions and participles as independent parts of speech (see respectively Matthaios 2001 [= 2005], 76-78 and 78-80; 2002, 179-184 and 185-187): in this process the grammarians beat a path independent from philosophical theorising, yet one which eventually came to represent the theoretical work's point of reference within the philosophical tradition. A more direct Stoic influence can however be recognised in the case of the adverb (Aristarchus' term for adverbs, μεσότης, seems to belong to the context of Stoic logic: see Matthaios 2001 [= 2005], 80; 2002, 187-188).

partly for historical reasons connected to the *secessio doctorum* that had led both to the reestablishment of philological study in centres such as Rhodes, Pergamum, Athens, and later also at Rome, and to the Alexandrians' encounter with Stoic-Pergamene ideas: Demetrius Ixion worked at Pergamum, Apollodorus also worked there and then at Athens, acting as an intermediary between the doctrine of Diogenes of Babylon and the grammarians; Dionysius Thrax was engaged at Rhodes, where the Stoic school was active first with Panaetius and later with Posidonius. Signs of a change in the Alexandrian tradition due to Stoic linguistic influence can also be detected in the work of Dionysius Thrax himself¹⁷³ and of Tyrannion, who was the author of a specific treatise *Περὶ μερισμοῦ τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν*¹⁷⁴.

In the surviving evidence for Tyrannion we can recognise clear signs of Alexandrian influence (e.g. the classification of *προσηγορικά ὀνόματα* not as a separate category, but in subordination to nouns [fr. 56 Haas]; and use of the term *κύριον ὄνομα* for the proper noun – for the Stoics simply *ὄνομα* [*ibid.*]), as well as other elements of Stoic derivation (e.g. the concept of *κύρια ὀνόματα* as *ἄτομα*, i.e. “individuals” [*ibid.*], which presupposes a reduction of the concept of *κύριον ὄνομα* to that of the personal name – not the case with Aristarchus¹⁷⁵; identification of the participle as a subdivision of the noun and its characterisation as “non-thematic”, i.e. derived [*ibid.*]; and the definition of pronouns as *σημειώσεις* because they refer to specific persons (*ὠρισμένα πρόσωπα*), a notion which reflects the Stoic idea of *πρόσωπον* as an actual individual, identifiable by means of deixis or anaphora [fr. 58 H.])¹⁷⁶.

This process of advancement led to a first codification by Trypho (second half of the Ist century B.C.), in whose work we find both a clear rejection of the Stoic view – especially when it came to the arrangement of *ὄνομα* and *προσηγορία* and the autonomy of the participle – and first theoretical foundations of the Alexandrian system¹⁷⁷. After Trypho,

173 Stoic elements in his thought include the notion of nouns and appellatives constituting two distinct categories, his definition of *ῥῆμα*, and the fact that he called pronouns *ἄρθρα δεικτικά*: these points are discussed in detail *supra*, 33. See Matthaios 2001 (= 2005), 84; 2002, 192–193.

174 On this work and its original title, see Haas 1977, 167–169.

175 See Matthaios 1996.

176 See Matthaios 2001 (= 2005), 85–86; 2002, 193–195.

177 See Matthaios 2001 (= 2005), 86–87; 2002, 195–197. Trypho's work in this area is documented by the rich catalogue of titles found in the *Suda* (τ 1115, s.v. Τρύφων Ἀμμωνίου; see Velsen 1853, 3–4). For Trypho's idea of *ὄνομα* and *προσηγορία*, see *sch. Marc. D.T.*, in GG I/III 356.21–357.26; for the participle, see fr. 39 von Velsen. Trypho's adherence to the Alexandrian tradition is

however, this evolution was prolonged for another couple of centuries or so, during which there was a great deal of vacillation and fluctuation, until the system achieved canonisation with Apollonius Dyscolus. He dedicated specific writings to every part of speech and its accidentia; he also synthesised the philological and philosophical traditions into a unitary construct, creatively integrating the Stoic theory into the Alexandrian doctrine and finally overcoming the two-pronged evolutionary line of the doctrine of the parts of speech¹⁷⁸.

Something that the history of this development, which lasted for roughly 400 years, throws into sharp relief is that the role played by Aristarchus and by his immediate predecessors and contemporaries was decisive for the codification and establishment of concepts and terminology concerning the system of language. This system was then studied on a theoretical level and gradually improved over the course of a long tradition of scholarship¹⁷⁹.

Studies of and opinions, often divergent, about the comprehensive model of ancient grammar have continued to flourish on the international scene¹⁸⁰: the miscellany volume edited by P. Swiggers and A. Wouters (2002a) served precisely as a kind of catch-basin for these. In the introduction to this book and in a later article (2005), they outline a reconstruction of the process of grammar's development into a separate discipline within the Greek world, emphasising its connections with philosophy, rhetoric, and poetics, and proposing a handful of guidelines for tracing the evolution of the model of parts of speech. The grammar of the philologists, i.e. their study of language with a view to textual criticism¹⁸¹, appears to constitute a stage within this evolution.

also demonstrated by his distinction of article (fr. 22-27 V.) and pronoun (fr. 28-37 V.), his assignment of the adverb (ἐπίρρημα) to a separate category (fr. 62-77 V.), and by his identical handling of the preposition (πρόθεσις: fr. 40 V.).

178 Matthaïos 2001 (= 2005), 88-89; 2002, 197-199.

179 The issue is well summarised in Matthaïos 2001 (= 2005), 70, 90; 2002, 168-169, 212-213.

180 To cite just a couple of recent examples, Law 2003, 54ff. dedicates a chapter in her survey of the history of linguistics to the description of language in antiquity, in which she examines the work of figures such as Aristophanes and Aristarchus as indications of the existence of some meta-linguistic notions beginning in the IInd century B.C., but not – or better, not necessarily – as evidence of a complex system of grammatical knowledge. On the other hand Matthews 2007 took the Alexandrian scholars' work alongside the expertise of the Stoic philosophers into consideration as an aspect of grammar's transformation into a technical science.

181 Swiggers/Wouters 2002b, in particular 11-17; 2005, in particular 8ff.

Thus in the debate's current state, the critical points hinge on one's choice of perspective: the ancient evidence, at least the evidence relating to the main figures in this history, has now been collected and studied *en bloc* and therefore no longer allows for observations to be made on the basis of a few examples picked from the heap of material. Nevertheless, disagreement persists regarding the nature of the first Hellenistic philologists' linguistic interests, a debate which may be ultimately traced back to the ancient dispute as to the epistemological value of *grammatike*: whether empirical in nature or a *techné*¹⁸². For one group of critics, the fact that the observations which the scholars – especially Aristarchus – made about language both arose from the context of their work on literary texts and were made to that end remains something that strongly prejudices evaluation of their nature. For these critics the philologists' linguistic interests, inasmuch as they originated as an offshoot of textual criticism and exegesis and never held the study of language as an aim in itself, did not have any independent speculative meaning: thus even if they recognise that these individuals had grammatical *competence*, they indeed still deem it unacceptable to credit them with a grammatical *theory*¹⁸³.

It is a fact that we do not find in Aristarchus and his contemporaries traces of (aspiration towards) comprehensive linguistic systematisation, nor of any specific treatises on such subjects; it is moreover certainly true that Alexandrian grammar was born, to use Ax's felicitous phrase, «im Kopf», as a basis and tool for understanding and interpreting literary texts. Nevertheless it is also possible to outline a framework in which philological research and linguistic discussion, far from being entirely separate fields or in conflict with each other, reveal themselves to be closely and productively interrelated, without the value of the latter being diminished as a consequence. The two areas have now been well synthesised by Matthaïos (2010b), who sets out primarily to verify how the observations of language made by the Alexandrians appeared in practice, what factors prepared and influenced their linguistic-grammatical argumentation, in what way grammatical rules were formed, and in what measure the text under consideration could prove decisive for the recording of a grammatical phenomenon and the recognition of a rule. He also investigates the ways in which the Alexandrians made abstractions on the basis of literary contexts so as to identify a

182 See Matthaïos 2010b, discussed at greater length below.

183 This kind of approach underlies e.g. F. Schironi's *Playing with language. Homeric grammar according to Aristarch*, a paper delivered at the 2nd *Trends in Classics* international conference (Thessaloniki, December 2008).

grammatical phenomenon, describe it, formulate a rule based upon it, and expand by means of it their apparatus of linguistic description. In particular, it is possible to demonstrate on these grounds that at least some of Aristarchus' linguistic observations effectively suggest a certain degree of abstraction, and presuppose some theoretical reference points (definitions, technical names, judgments as to a certain category of forms' correctness)¹⁸⁴. The fact that these general formulations born out of the demands of the work of *diorthosis* of literary texts could then find concrete application precisely in that work completes the picture of the interaction – and not opposition – between grammar and philology.

This seems to be the view that best illuminates the conditions behind the Hellenistic philologists' first approaches to linguistics, and the means by which those approaches were realised, since it assigns just importance to "grammatical" interventions on texts, without however failing to recognise textual criticism and exegesis as the original motivation. In this way, we can set aside the idea that there was a clear gap in the field of linguistic study between Aristarchus' era and that of the next generations in favour of a view of a process marked by evolution and successive refinements, developed over the course of centuries thanks also to comparison with the work of the predecessors, pioneers in this field of study.

184 The examples mentioned by Matthaïos pertain to the category of the pronoun: these have to do with the description of pronouns as «words that form series according to person» (fr. 103 M.), the coinage of the name ἐπιταγματική (*scil.* ἀντωνυμία?) for the form αὐτός when used alongside tonic forms of personal and possessive pronouns (fr. 120 M.), and criticism of the correctness of composite pronouns' third-person plural forms (fr. 125 M.).

The Greek Origins of the Romans and the Roman Origins of Homer in the Homeric Scholia and in *POxy.* 3710

Paola Ascheri

To Albio and our son Valerio

1. The Greek origins of the Romans and Latin as an Aeolian dialect

Between the IIIrd and IInd centuries B.C., a subject of much debate in Rome was the origins of the *Urbs*. Though by no means new – the question was already discussed as far back as the Vth century B.C. – the origins of the city became of considerable importance as it started to develop as the dominant power of the Mediterranean area. In this period, two theories as to the origins of the city were widespread: one, supported amongst others by Timaeus of Tauromenium (IVth–IIIrd centuries B.C.), claimed that Rome had Trojan origins by way of Aeneas' escape from Troy¹; the other suggested that the Romans had a Greek, or more specifically, an Arcadian origin². Both positions inevitably satisfied

English translation by Justin Rainey.

- 1 The tradition of the Trojan origins of the Romans apparently can be traced back to some Greek historians of the Vth century B.C. and was evidenced also by Roman families of the IVth–IIIrd centuries B.C.: see Gabba 1976, 95; Vanotti 1995, 23ff., 51ff.; Delcourt 2005, 97 and n. 68. This theory was supported, albeit with some differences, also by Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas, Polemon of Ilium and Agathocles of Cyzicus: see Gabba 1976, 88–90 and Ferrary 1988, 224ff. For an overview see Gabba 1974, 631–632, with further references, and Gabba 1976. According to Hill 1961, 90, it was Augustus who “adopted” the Trojan Aeneas as official founder of Rome.
- 2 See Gabba 1963, in particular 191ff., who highlights the fact that the idea of the Romans' Arcadian origins had already been the subject of debate in the ancient Greek world (before the Vth century B.C.). In Roman historiography, the tradition of the Arcadian colonisation of Latium starts with Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus (IIIrd–IInd centuries B.C.). The question is particularly com-

differing political and ideological needs, with the first justifying Rome's imperialistic presence in Greece and Asia Minor³, whilst the second sought to encourage acceptance by the Greeks of their new Roman masters⁴. Importantly, in some ancient testimonies, these two theories seem to overlap because the Trojans were assimilated to the Greeks. This occurs because in certain quarters and at particular chronological and socio-cultural levels the idea spread that the Trojans, albeit not Greeks, were assimilable to them and in any case no longer enemies⁵. This helps to highlight how those investigating a sensitive and crucially important subject, such as the origins of Rome, over different periods and from different ideological, political and propagandistic viewpoints, regularly found themselves in a complex and tortuous research environment.

In this paper, I will focus on the theory that the Romans were of Greek descent by examining traces present in two kinds of text that have received, from this perspective, little attention: the Homeric scholia and a passage from an important commentary on book XX of the *Odyssey*, transmitted in a papyrus published in the mid Eighties, found in Oxyrhynchus and dated to the IInd century A.D., namely *POxy.* 3710 (col. II, ll. 26–31, *ad v.* 151).

plicated, as shown by the fact that scholarly opinions diverge on this point: for example Ferrary 1988, 223 and Vanotti 1995, 57ff. maintain that Fabius Pictor was one of the earliest supporters in Roman circles of the hypothesis of Rome's *Trojan* origins. For the possible reasoning on which the theory of Rome's Arcadian ancestry was grounded, see Bayet 1920 and Baladié 1980, 295. In general on the relationship between Greece and Rome in the age of Roman imperialism, see Ferrary 1988; in particular the different theories concerning the origins of Rome are discussed on 223ff.

- 3 On this point, Justin's account is especially significant (IInd century A.D.), 31.8.1–4: «Igitur cum ab utrisque bellum pararetur ingressisque Asiam Romani Ilium venissent, mutua gratulatio Iliensium ac Romanorum fuit, Iliensibus Aeneam ceterosque cum eo duces a se profectos, Romanis se ab his procreatos referentibus; tantaque laetitia omnium fuit, quanta esse post longum tempus inter parentes et liberos solet. Iuvabat Ilienses nepotes suos Occidente et Africa domita Asiam ut avitum regnum vindicare, optabilem Troiae ruinam fuisse dicentes, ut tam feliciter renasceretur. Contra Romanos avitos lares et incunabula maiorum templaque ac deorum simulacra inexplabile desiderium videndi tenebat». See Norden 1901, 256–257.
- 4 See Dubuisson 1984, 64ff.; Delcourt 2005, 216.
- 5 See Gabba 1976, 98; Vanotti 1995, 24ff., 30ff.; *contra* Hill 1961, 90ff., who, in highlighting the anti-Greek tone of the *Aeneid*, placed the Greeks and Trojans constantly on opposing fronts. As regards Dionysius' ideas on this point, see *infra*.

The doctrine of the Greek (i.e. Arcadian) origins of the Romans was extremely popular between the IIIrd century B.C. and the Augustan epoch. This position was supported and promoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (60–7 B.C.), a Greek historian with openly-declared Roman sympathies, who had the merit of collecting, organising and developing ideas that originated centuries earlier⁶. He also sought to link the Arcadian theory with the Trojan one, by attempting to show that also the Trojans who reached Italy with Aeneas were Greeks and more specifically Arcadians as descendents of Dardanus⁷.

Dionysius, who lived and taught in Rome for many years from 30 B.C., devoted part of *Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία* (in particular books I and

-
- 6 Gabba 1974, 641; Dubuisson 1984, 66. Prior to Dionysius, the Arcadian Polybius (IIIrd–IInd centuries B.C.) is thought to have supported the Arcadian origins of the Romans. On this point, see Bickerman 1952, 67; Gabba 1963, 192 n. 21; Ferrary 1988, 226; Delcourt 2005, 100–105. The literature on Dionysius and on Rome's Arcadian origins is vast. See among others Baladié 1980, 288–289; Gabba 1982, 800; Dubuisson 1984, 65ff.; Ferrary 1988, 227ff.; Vanotti 1995, 14ff. Vanotti 1995 is in fact dedicated entirely to those chapters in the work of Dionysius that concentrate on the origins of Rome and the role of Aeneas (1.45–64). Vanotti 1995 also provides a useful bibliography (303–318). More recently Delcourt 2005 analyses Dionysius' particular position between the Greek and Roman worlds (bibliography: 371–403). As regards specifically the Dionysian theory of Rome as a “Greek city” see 105 ff., whilst as for his “panarcadianism” see 130–156.
- 7 1.61.1: “Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὸν Τρώων ἔθνος Ἑλληνικὸν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα ἦν ἐκ Πελοποννήσου ποτὲ ὠρμημένον, εἶρηται μὲν καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ πάλαι, λεχθήσεται δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἐμοῦ δι’ ὀλίγων. See also 1.68–69 and Delcourt 2005, 141–143. As regards Dionysius' desire to emphasise the existence of a Greek-Trojan “axis”, in which the latter can be traced to the former, it is significant that shortly after (1.72.2) the historian cites a passage, albeit uncertain, of Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) in which the foundation of Rome is attributed to the joint action of Aeneas and Odysseus: ὁ δὲ τὰς ἱερείας τὰς ἐν Ἀργεὶ καὶ τὰ καθ' ἐκάστην πραχθέντα συναγαγὼν Αἰνείαν φησὶν ἐκ Μολοττῶν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἔλθόντα μετ' Ὀδυσσεά οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι τῆς πόλεως, ὀνομάσαι δ' αὐτὴν ἀπὸ μιᾶς τῶν Ἰλιάδων Ῥώμης. ταύτην δὲ λέγει ταῖς ἄλλαις Τρωάσι παρακελευσαμένην κοινῇ μετ' αὐτῶν ἐμπρῆσαι τὰ σκάφη βαρυνομένην τῇ πλάνῃ. On this passage, see Solmsen 1986. Vanotti 1995, 17ff. offers a different interpretation according to which Dionysius probably did not accept Hellanicus' version because «citare al fianco di Enea l'itacense Ulisse ... avrebbe significato sottolineare la differenza di stirpe fra i due eroi, l'uno a tutti gli effetti greco, l'altro troiano, e come tale rappresentante di un popolo alternativo al greco, per essersi ad esso opposto in una guerra decennale». Delcourt 2005, 84–87, in particular 85–86, instead posits that it was extremely likely that Hellanicus meant that Aeneas had *arrived* in Italy with Odysseus and not that he had *founded* Rome with him.

VII) to his thesis that the Romans “were Greeks” owing to the fact that the city of Rome had been founded by Greek settlers coming from many different places⁸. One of the arguments used by Dionysius in support of this position was the similarity existing at that time between Greek and Roman linguistic, religious and festive customs⁹. The historian posited that, at the dawn of Hellenic civilisation, the Greeks had customs and traditions that were lost over time, but which the Romans actually preserved. In other words, the differences existing between Greek and Roman customs were caused by the fact that the Greeks slowly abandoned the customs and conventions of their ancestors, whilst the Romans maintained them¹⁰. Dionysius tried to demonstrate that from the foundation of Rome onwards, the Romans lived as Greeks and continued in his time to do so, being as they were of Greek origin. The proof allegedly lay in the similarity of Roman and Homeric customs: in Dionysius’ opinion, the Romans preserved the most remote Greek customs, as demonstrated by the most ancient and authoritative of Greek poets, Homer¹¹. We shall see how this idea proves to be fundamental in

8 See 1.5.1: ... ἐν ταύτῃ δηλώσω τῇ γραφῇ, δι’ ἧς Ἑλληνὰς τε αὐτοὺς ὄντας ἐπιδείξειν ὑπισχνοῦμαι καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν ἐλαχίστων ἢ φαυλοτάτων ἔθνων συνελλυθότας; 7.70.1-2: ... ἀλλ’ ἵνα τῶν ἀναγκαίων τι πιστώσῃται πραγμάτων, ὅτι τὰ συνοικίσαντα ἔθνη τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν Ἑλληνικὰ ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων ἀποικισθέντα τόπων, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἔνιοι νομίζουσι βάρβαρα καὶ ἀνέστια; 7.72.18: ... καὶ μὲν πίστει τῇδε ἀρκοῦμενος οὐ βαρβάρους ἐπέισθην εἶναι τοὺς οἰκιστὰς τῆς Ῥώμης, ἀλλ’ ἐκ πολλῶν τόπων συνελλυθότας Ἑλλήνας. See Hill 1961, 88.

9 Hill 1961, 89.

10 See, e.g., 2.9.2 and 2.12-14 (regarding, respectively, the Greek origin of the Roman institution of *clientela* and of the Senate); 5.73.3-5.74.4 (as regards “dictatorship”, a form of government that Dionysius believed to have been imported by the Romans from the Greeks); 7.72.1-4 (as regards the Roman custom of competing during public games naked but for a costume covering the intimate parts of the body; according to Dionysius this custom had originated from the Greeks, but was already lost by the Lacedaemonians, who had been the first to compete completely naked. The Romans, however, in conserving this ancient Greek custom, continued, at least up to the time of Dionysius, to cover the *pudenda* during the games); 7.72.5 (as regards the Roman custom of the procession of the athletes on their way to the venue of the *ludi* being accompanied by players of the *barbiton*, a traditional Greek instrument no longer in use in Greece, but still used by the Romans). See Gabba 1982, 810-811.

11 In almost all the cases cited at note 10, reference is made to Homer: 5.74.2 and above all 7.72.3-4, where two examples are provided, one from the *Iliad* (Ψ 685) and one from the *Odyssey* (σ 66-69 and 74). See also, e.g., 7.72.8-9 (which cites Σ 494-496, 590-594, 603-605 on the question of the ancient roots of the Pyrrhic dance), 7.72.15-17 (where Dionysius compares Roman sacrifici-

understanding the position also of other ancient exegetes interested in the subject¹².

The theory of the Greek origin of the Romans has an inevitable “linguistic” consequence, which Dionysius examines at the end of book I. If we accept that the Romans are descendants of the Greeks then also their language, Latin, must be a derivation of Greek. More precisely, it was suggested that Latin was in fact an Aeolian dialect, deriving as it does from Arcadian¹³. As a matter of fact, in the reconstruction proposed by Dionysius, Latium had been colonised by the Arcadians of Evander sixty years prior to the Trojan War¹⁴ and the Arcadians, who spoke an Aeolian dialect, introduced the use of the Greek alphabet, after founding Pallantium, the first nucleus of Rome¹⁵. The presence of the letter di-

cial rites with those found in ξ 422-429). It should be noted, as pointed out also in Dubuisson 1987, 15 and n. 4, that Eustathius too appears to be moving in the same direction when, at least in five cases, he compares Roman customs to those cited in Homeric poems (see *infra*): 409.9 (643.3-4 van der Valk) *ad* Γ 228; 436, 24-25 (687.15-16 van der Valk) *ad* Δ 3-4; 1037.58 (785.14 van der Valk) *ad* Ο 689; 1209.10 (410-411 van der Valk) *ad* Υ 299; 1359.40 (935.7 van der Valk) *ad* Ω 471. Hillscher 1892, 435-439 infers that Eustathius’ source for these passages is Aristodemus of Nysa (Ist century A.D.); on the latter’s theory of Homer’s Roman origins see the following note and *infra* (on this point, the passages chosen by Hillscher from Eustathius’ text do not fully coincide with those selected by Dubuisson 1987: Hillscher examines also 882.14 (318-319 van der Valk) *ad* Λ 750, but omits 1209.10 (410-411 van der Valk) *ad* Υ 299).

- 12 Aristodemus of Nysa interpreted two usages found in Homer which were still in fashion among the Romans but had already fallen from use among the Greeks of his time as proof of the poet’s Roman origins. On this point see *infra* and Dubuisson 1987, 22-23 with references.
- 13 1.90.1: Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ φωνὴν μὲν οὐτ’ ἄκρως βάρβαρον οὐτ’ ἀπηρτισμένως Ἑλλάδα φθέγγονται, μικτὴν δὲ τινα ἐξ ἀμφοῖν, ἥς ἐστιν ἡ πλείων Αἰολίς ... See Hill 1961, 92. On the question of the similarity between Aeolian and Arcadian proposed by the ancients but dismissed by modern linguists, who are convinced of substantial differences between the two dialects, see Briquel 1984, 447-449 and Dubuisson 1987, 20 and n. 28.
- 14 1.31.1: Μετὰ δὲ οὐ πολὺν χρόνον στόλος ἄλλος Ἑλληνικὸς εἰς ταῦτα τὰ χωρία τῆς Ἰταλίας κατάγεται, ἐξηκοστῷ μάλιστα ἔτει πρότερον τῶν Τρωικῶν, ὡς αὐτοὶ Ῥωμαῖοι λέγουσιν, ἐκ Παλλαντίου πόλεως Ἀρκαδικῆς ἀναστάς. ἡγεῖτο δὲ τῆς ἀποικίας Εὐάνδρος Ἐρμοῦ λεγόμενος καὶ νύμφης τινὸς Ἀρκάσιν ἐπιχωρίας, ἣν οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες Θέμιν εἶναι λέγουσι καὶ θεοφόρητον ἀποφαινουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὰς Ῥωμαϊκὰς συγγράψαντες ἀρχαιολογίας τῇ πατρίᾳ γλώσσῃ Καρμέντην ὀνομάζουσιν' ...
- 15 1.31.3: οἱ δὲ Ἀρκάδες, ὡς ἡ Θέμις αὐτοῖς ἐπιθειάζουσα ἔφραζεν, αἰροῦνται λόφον ὀλίγον ἀπέχοντα τοῦ Τεβέριος, ὃς ἐστὶ νῦν ἐν μέσῳ μάλιστα τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως, καὶ κατασκευάζονται πρὸς αὐτῷ κώμην βραχεῖαν, δυσὶ ναυτικοῖς πληρώμασιν ἐν οἷς ἀπανέστησαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποχωρῶσαν, ἣν

gamma/vau both in Latin and Aeolian, remarked on also by Varro and Didymus, also proves, it was suggested, the existence of a relation between the two dialects¹⁶.

This theory, whose authorship is uncertain¹⁷, was probably systematised for the first time in the early Ist century B.C. by the grammarian Tyrannion the elder¹⁸ (or Tyrannion the younger as others believe¹⁹) and was a few years later re-examined by Varro²⁰ (116–27 B.C.) – with whom Dionysius was certainly in contact in Roman circles and by whom he was inevitably influenced²¹ –, by Philoxenus²² (Ist century

ἔμελλε τὸ πεπρωμένον σὺν χρόνῳ θήσιν ὅσιν οὐθ' Ἑλλάδα πόλιν οὐτε βάρβαρον κατὰ τε οἰκήσεως μέγεθος καὶ κατὰ δυναστείας ἀξίωσιν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἅπασαν εὐτυχίαν, χρόνον τε ὅπόσον ἂν ὁ θνητὸς αἰὼν ἀντέχῃ πόλεων μάλιστα πασῶν μνημονευθησομένην. On the theory of Latin as an Aeolian dialect, see Collart 1954, 215–218; Gabba 1963, 190ff.; Marin 1969, 597ff. and, more recently, Briquel 1984, in particular 446ff.

- 16 1.20.2–3: (The Aborigines) σπένδονται τε δὴ πρὸς τοὺς Πελασγοὺς καὶ διδόασιν αὐτοῖς χωρία τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδασάμενοι τὰ περὶ τὴν ἱερὰν λίμνην, ἐν οἷς ἦν τὰ πολλὰ ἐλώδη, ἃ νῦν κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς διαλέκτου τρόπον Οὐέλια ὀνομάζεται. σύνηθες γὰρ ἦν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Ἑλλήσιν ὡς τὰ πολλὰ προτιθέναι τῶν ὀνομάτων, ὁπόσων αἱ ἀρχαὶ ἀπὸ φωνηέντων ἐγίνοντο, τὴν οὐ συλλαβὴν ἐνὶ στοιχείῳ γραφομένην. τοῦτο δ' ἦν ὥσπερ γάμμα διτταῖς ἐπὶ μίαν ὀρθὴν ἐπιζευγνύμενον ταῖς πλαγίοις, ὡς φελῆνη καὶ φάναξ καὶ φοῖκος καὶ φαῖρ καὶ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα. See Varro, in Funaioli 1907, 291 (fr. 270 = fr. 46 Wilmanns); Didymus, in Funaioli 1907, 447 (fr. 1 = fr. 1 Schmidt). For both, see *infra*.
- 17 According to Funaioli 1907, XVI, 107–108 (frs. 1–3), followed by Giomini 1953, 365, Collart 1954, 207–208, Christes 1979, 66 n. 466, Dubuisson 1984, 60 and Perrone 2006, Hypsicrates (Ist century B.C.–Ist century A.D.) was the first grammarian known to have discovered the Greek origin of Latin words. More precisely, Giomini 1953, 365 maintains that this theory was formulated for the first time in Greece by the Stoics (IInd century B.C.), and was subsequently resumed in Rome by Aelius Stilo (born around 150 B.C.), and in Greece by Hypsicrates. Doubts as to the importance of the latter in the formulation of the theory are however expressed by Gabba 1963, 189 and n. 4. On these problems, see Briquel 1984, 450ff.
- 18 Funaioli 1907, XV–XVI; Collart 1954, 106, 208; Gabba 1963, 189.
- 19 Wendel 1948, 1820; Christes 1979, 66; Briquel 1984, 450; Dubuisson 1984, 60–61; 1987, 19 and n. 27; Cassio 1993, 85 n. 41. Pagani 2006b does not take a position on the question.
- 20 Probably in his *De origine linguae latinae*. See Funaioli 1907, 84 and 311–312; Dahlmann 1935, 1219–1220; Collart 1954, 205–228; Briquel 1984, 446ff.; Dubuisson 1984, 62.
- 21 Gabba 1982, 805–806.
- 22 Funaioli 1907, XXI, 443–446; Wendel 1941, 196; Giomini 1953; Di Benedetto 1958–1959, 202; Theodoridis 1976, frs. 311–322; Christes 1979, 66

B.C.) and by Didymus Chalcenterus (Ist century B.C.–Ist century A.D.)²³, all active, with the possible exception of Didymus²⁴, in Rome. This doctrine had the precise aim of refuting the opinion, widespread amongst anti-Roman Greeks, that Latin was a “barbarian” language²⁵ and in practical terms looked for the Greek etymology of Latin words or identified phonetic, lexical and semantic parallels between the two languages²⁶. The question continued to be followed during the Augustan age by some less important Roman erudites (L. Ateius Praetextatus Philologus²⁷, Cloatius Verus²⁸), but the idea of Latin as a Greek dialect – just as that of Romans’ Greek origins – died out in the Ist century A.D.²⁹.

2. Greeks and Romans in the scholia to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*

It is easy to imagine how the question of the Greek origin of Latin and, at a more general level, of the Roman people was the object of a con-

n. 466; Dubuisson 1984, 60 and 66–67 (who views Philoxenus as the first to formulate the theory of the Aeolian origin of Latin); Razzetti 2003b. On the influences of Philoxenus on Varro and vice versa, see Collart 1954, 344 n. 10; Briquel 1984, 451–453; Dubuisson 1984, 66–67.

- 23 See Schmidt 1854, 345ff. (fr. 1–5); Funaioli 1907, 447ff. (fr. 1–5); Montana 2006b. Only Christes 1979, 66 n. 466, Dubuisson 1984, 61 and 1987, 20 n. 27 follow the entry of the *Suda* (δ 874 Adler) and identify Didymus the author of the Περί τῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἀναλογίας with Claudius Didymus of the age of Nero.
- 24 The hypothesis that Chalcenterus stayed in Rome was put forward by Schmidt 1854, 2–3: he suggested that the two entries of the *Suda*, one relating to Didymus Chalcenterus and the other to Didymus the younger (respectively δ 872 and 873 Adler), were mixed up. Schmidt refers to the former the Roman sojourn described by the *Suda* as having been Didymus the younger’s. This opinion did not receive wide support (see, e.g., Pfeiffer 1968, 274) and today we have no clear evidence that Chalcenterus ever sojourned in Rome.
- 25 Dubuisson 1984, 60. This idea is strictly connected to the conventional theory that Rome was a barbarian city until it was “civilised” as a result of its contact with the Greeks; the most notable expression of this theory can be found in this passage from Horace: «Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes / intulit agresti Latio» (*Epist.* 2.1.156–157). See Hill 1961, 92; Delcourt 2005, 107–108, 145 and n. 75.
- 26 Dubuisson 1984, 62.
- 27 Goetz 1896, 1910–1911.
- 28 Goetz 1900, 61–62. On both, see Dubuisson 1984, 62–63.
- 29 On the reasons for the decline, see Dubuisson 1984, 63ff. and 1987, 21.

siderable scholarly debate from the Augustan age onwards on the part of other Greek grammarians besides those already mentioned³⁰.

In order to shed more light on this debate, I shall examine accounts concerning the city of Rome, the *res Romanae* and the relationship between Greeks and Romans preserved in one of the most valuable texts for the study of Greek philology of the Hellenistic and Roman ages, i.e. the *corpus* of Homeric scholia.

In some cases these scholia render some Homeric words with Greek ones which are in fact borrowings from Latin (e.g. σταῦλον from Lat. *stab(u)lum*; see n. 31). This is obviously due to the *sources* of the scholia, in which these Latin borrowings were very common since they were written in late Hellenistic and Roman times. Therefore I shall not take these instances into consideration because they cannot be linked to the problem I am going to examine in the following pages³¹.

Moreover, since also Eustathius in certain cases suggested connections between Homeric and Roman customs³², I will only examine his considerations when they relate to the content of a scholium (this is the case solely of *sch. ad B* 384).

30 Dubuisson 1984, 59–60 reveals that interest in Latin's Greek origins could be found solely amongst Greek grammarians living and working in Rome rather than those, for instance, working in Rhodes or Alexandria. It is suggested that such interest was due to the relations the grammarians had with prominent Roman individuals which heightened their interest in Latin language and culture. As these grammarians had been slaves freed by Roman notables, whose children they often taught, a critical view of the Roman world and its language was out of the question. On the influence of Greek grammarians on Roman society and culture and on the attitude of the Romans to them, see McNelis 2002.

31 I refer here to the following cases: scholia to the *Iliad*: *sch. A ad B* 634 (Ariston. | ex.), where, in the exegetic section, we find that the fortress of Cephallenia, always referred to as "Samos", was called by the Romans *kastron*; scholia to the *Odyssey*: *sch. VBHQ ad π* 471, where it is explained that in the Greek world, Roman milestones were called Ἑρμαῖοι λόφοι, "the hills of Hermes" (on the ongoing debate as to the real significance of Ἑρμαῖος λόφος see Hoekstra 1993⁴, 295–296); *sch. QVVind. 56 ad ω* 208, in which the correspondence is highlighted between the Homeric (and Attic) κλισιον (a place destined to servants, the nature and form of which were discussed in ancient and modern criticism; see Fernández-Galiano/Heubeck 1993⁴, 360 *ad loc.*) and the word of Latin origin σταῦλον, clearly deriving from *stab(u)lum* (a standing place, quarters, abode for carts and animals).

32 *Supra* n. 11.

2.1. Scholia to the *Iliad*

There are five passages found in the body of scholia to the *Iliad* that are useful in this research and which concern Roman linguistic conventions, legends and monuments. They are presented below on the basis of their order in the Homeric text.

Sch. T^{il} | b (BCE³) *ad* B 384 (ex. | ex.): <ἄρματος ἀμφὶς ἰδών:> περιβλεψάμενος τὸ ἄρμα. | τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ †Θουκυδίδης† ἐν Πολιτείαις φησὶ τὸ ὄπλισμα.

Eust. 243.14 *ad loc.* (370.9 van der Valk): ὅτι δὲ ἡ τοῦ ἄρματος λέξις καὶ ἐπὶ ὄπλου λέγεται καὶ ὅτι Ῥωμαϊκὸν τοῦτο καὶ ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ ὁμωνυμία ἐντεῦθεν γίνεται, δηλοῦσιν οἱ παλαιοὶ σοφοί.

In B 384 Agamemnon urges his soldiers to be ready for battle, sharpening lance and sword, feeding the horses (vv. 382–383) and checking carefully the war chariot (ἄρματος ἀμφὶς ἰδών). The first of the two exegetic notes referring to the verse interprets ἄρμα correctly as “war chariot”, whilst the second adds that an author, identified as Thucydides³³, in the *Constitutions* used the term ἄρμα not to represent a chariot but a suit of armour.

As is clear, no explicit mention is made either of Rome or the Romans, but from Eustathius’ commentary of the passage we can understand the connection between the scholium and the subject in question. In fact, Eustathius declares that for some “ancient learned men” (he does not provide indications as to their number or whether Thucydides was one of them) the word ἄρμα could be used also to identify armour and that this was a Roman usage. Almost certainly, reference is made here to the Latin word *arma*, *armorum*, “weapons, armour” (not “chariot”). Therefore, even though in Homer’s passage ἄρμα without doubt means “war chariot”, in the ancient world there were already some σοφοί who interpreted ἄρμα as “armour” and I believe it is extremely likely that this exegesis was grounded on the Latin *arma*³⁴. Such an interpretation is for us totally mistaken given that in Greek and not only in Homer ἄρμα never means “weapons” or “armour”. In my opinion, this is an example where the semantic value of a Greek word is forced in order to make it

33 Erbse, in the apparatus *ad loc.*, proposes that Θουκυδίδης is a mistake for Ἀριστοτέλης. Moreover, in Rose and Gigon’s edition of Aristotelian fragments, there is no trace of the scholium.

34 Clearly, the primary reason for identifying Greek *harma* with Latin *arma* lies in the almost perfect homophony between the two terms.

the equivalent of a Latin word as part of a more general aim of demonstrating Latin's Greek origins.

Sch. b (BCE^{3E4}) *T ad O* 683–684 (ex.): ὁ δ' <ἔμπεδον> ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ / θρώσκων <— πέτονται>: μέγα τὸ ἐγκώμιον καὶ ἀσφαλῶς καὶ αἰεὶ ἐφαλλομένου. Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Γονύπεσός <φησι> τεθεωρηκέναι τοῦ μεταβαίνοντος, ἀνεμπόδιστον τηροῦντος τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἵππων, κατέχοντος τοὺς χαλινούς. καὶ νῦν δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ποιοῦσιν τινες. τὸ δὲ αἰεὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ συνεχῶς κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν, ὡς τὸ “αἰεὶ δ' ἡνίοχον κονίης ῥαθάμιγγες ἔβαλλον” (Ψ 502).

The fury of Ajax during the Achean counterattack in book XV is described by Homer by means of a simile in which the hero's force as he strides between the ships is compared to the passion with which a horseman incites four horses yoked together to gallop and he, without stopping (vv. 683–684), jumps skilfully from one horse to another. The exegetic scholium to verses 683–684 tells us that Demetrius Gonypesus, a grammarian of unknown origin who lived before the IInd century A.D.³⁵, had witnessed a similar scene and that in Rome “now” (καὶ νῦν δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ) such attractions, i.e. horsemen jumping from one moving horse to another, could be seen³⁶. Modern scholars do not agree on the pericope that involves Roman usage. For instance, H. Erbse, in the apparatus to the scholium, believes it to be an observation of the scholiast³⁷ or perhaps of Epaphroditus, a Greek grammarian of the Ist century A.D., who lived in Rome as a teacher³⁸; however Erbse rejects the possibility that the observation is due to Gonypesus, but fails to provide any evidence for his suggestion regarding Epaphroditus. L. Cohn, instead, probably following Eustathius *ad loc.*³⁹, believes that the observation likely belongs to Demetrius and indeed from this we can infer that the grammarian had spent a period of time in Rome⁴⁰. Although Cohn does

35 Ascheri 2009.

36 For this use see also Isid. *Orig.* 18.39, *De desultoribus*: «Desultores nominati, quod olim, prout quisque ad finem cursus venerat, desiliebat, et currebat, sive quod de equo in equum transiliebat». For a discussion of the *desultores* see Pollock 1903.

37 This is the opinion also of Schmidt 1976, 231.

38 See amongst others Cohn 1905, 2711–2714; Christes 1979, 103–104; Braswell 2002, 161–171; Braswell-Billerbeck 2008, 25–27.

39 Eust. 1037.58 (785.14 van der Valk) *ad loc.*: ἐν δὲ παλαιοῖς σχολίοις γέγραπται, ὅτι Δημήτριός φησι τεθεωρηκέναι τινὰ μεταβαίνοντα, ὡς ὁ ποιητὴς λέγει, κατέχοντα τοὺς χαλινούς καὶ ἀνεμπόδιστως τηροῦντα τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἵππων, καὶ ὅτι καὶ νῦν ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῦτο γίνεται.

40 Cohn 1901.

not provide additional evidence in support of his position, I cannot understand Erbse's view that the observation was made by the scholiast; the syntax may certainly be fragmented, but this feature is typical of the scholia. I feel Cohn's proposal is more credible and in line with the picture I have been drawing so far: if the observation is Gonypesus' and furthermore the movement from one horse to another pertains to the Rome of the Ist and IInd centuries A.D., we have in the scholia an attempt to find in Augustan Rome a parallel between a Roman and a Greek Homeric custom. This is true even if we accept Erbse's second hypothesis – which, however, as we have seen, is not supported by any explanation – in favour of Epaphroditus, who must have lived, again as we have seen, in the Rome of the Ist century A.D.⁴¹.

Sch. T ad Y 307–308 a¹ (ex.): <νῦν δὲ δὴ> Αἰνείαιο βίη < — γένωνται>: οἱ μὲν διὰ Ῥωμαίους φασίν, ἅπερ εἰδέναι τὸν ποιητὴν ἐκ τῶν Σιβύλλης χρησμῶν, οἱ δέ, ὅτι Αἰολεῖς ἐξέβαλον τοὺς ἀπογόνους Αἰνείου. πταίουσι δέ, ὅσοι φασὶ τοῦτο εἰδυῖαν Ἀφροδίτην μηχανήσασθαι τὸν Τρωϊκὸν πόλεμον.

Sch. b (BE³) ad Y 307–308 a² (ex.): τὸ νῦν (307) τὸ μέλλον δηλοῖ. οἱ δὲ Αἰνείου ἀπόγονοι καὶ Ῥώμην κτίζουσιν· οὐ γὰρ οἱ τῶν παίδων παῖδες μόνῃς ἄρχουσι τῆς Ἰλίου. οἱ δὲ φασιν, οὐδὲ τὸ Ἰλιον Αἰνείας ἔκτισεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ βίη (307) ἀντὶ τοῦ γενεὰ λαμβάνουσιν.

Sch. A ad Y 307 a¹ (Ariston. | D): νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαιο <βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει>: σημειοῦνται τινες πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν, καὶ ἐπεὶ μεταγράφευσί τινες “Αἰνείω γενεῇ πάντεσσιν ἀνάξει”, ὡς προθεσπίζοντος τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχήν. | Ἀφροδίτη χρημοῦ ... τὴν Ἑλένην. ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἀκουσιλάῳ (*FGrHist* 2 F 39).

Book XX describes the so-called “battle of the gods”, who, on the orders of Zeus, take the side of the favoured heroes. The first clash is between Achilles and Aeneas, the former supported by Hera and Athena, whilst the latter is flanked by Poseidon, who, in his attempt to convince the other divinities to save Aeneas' life, declares that the hero must survive the war so that his descendants may reign over the Trojans (vv. 307–308: νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαιο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται).

Ancient sources and particularly the scholia to this passage, at times in contrast with each other, provide evidence that there were many

41 Braswell-Billerbeck 2008 do not enter into the question.

versions of Aeneas' flight from Troy and his subsequent wanderings⁴². Needless to say, the stages subsequently attributed to the hero's journey were the fruit of ideological motives on the part of those who wrote them⁴³.

The exegetic scholium to 307-308 *a*¹ is proof of a search for consistency by ancient commentators. According to some, with the words «now the force of Aeneas will reign over the Trojans / and the children's children to come» Poseidon is referring to the future domination of the Romans over Asia Minor and given that Homer could not have known that centuries after him the Romans would have reigned over Troas, some exegetes (οἱ μὲν) resolved the anachronism by suggesting that the poet had been informed about the matter by the oracles of the Trojan Sibylla. Such an exegesis projects the dominion of Aeneas' descendants over Troy far ahead in time, right up to the advent and expansion of the Roman Empire. Others however (οἱ δέ) appear to have interpreted Poseidon's words as having a shorter timeframe, with Aeolian supremacy over Troy lasting up to the final conquest of Troas by the Aeolians (VIIIth century B.C. ca.)⁴⁴.

In the exegetic scholium to 307-308 *a*² the foundation of Rome is explicitly attributed to the descendants of Aeneas, whilst in the first part of the scholium to 307 *a*¹, which goes back to Aristonicus, attention is drawn, as already in the scholium to 307-308 *a*¹, to the fact that Homer appears to "prophesy" the future power of Rome and, specifically with this in mind, contains a proposal, offered by "some", to correct in verse 307 Τρώεσσιν with πάντεσσιν, thereby extending Aeneas' power (i.e. the power of Rome) to the whole world and not confining it solely to Troy⁴⁵.

42 See, e.g., Dion. 1.45-64 and Vanotti's 1995 comment.

43 The literature that offers an ideological interpretation is considerable. See, amongst many others, Smith 1981, who supplies a useful overview of those scholars convinced that book XX of the *Iliad* and the *Hymn to Aphrodite* were written in order to please (and provide noble origins to) the barbarian princes of the Troad, who believed they were the direct descendents of Aeneas.

44 This scholium has been the object of various interpretations and its meaning is not completely clear. Schwartz 1881, 417 n. 3, followed amongst others by Jacoby, *FGrHist* 2 F 39 *Komm.*, modified the transmitted text by inserting the negation οὐκ before ἐξέβαλον: in this way the invasion of the Aeolians is described as being ineffective and unsuccessful («... the Aeolians <did not> repel the descendents of Aeneas»), thereby moving forward in time the prospect of the domination of the Aeneads on Asia Minor. For an accurate analysis of this conjecture, see Smith 1981, 29 n. 21.

45 West 1998-2000, II, in his apparatus to Y 307, attributes this conjecture to an exegete prior to Aristarchus. If this is the case, the Homeric text may have been

This group of scholia is relevant to our research as it reveals an interest above all in the (Trojan) origins of Rome. It also reveals that the only voice which is clearly identifiable amongst the sources of these scholia is that of Aristonicus, a Greek grammarian active between the Ist century B.C. and the Ist century A.D. in Rome⁴⁶, namely the time and place in which the debate concerning the origins of Rome was likely to have been, as we have seen, the most heated. It is also probable that Aristonicus agrees with a conjecture (πάντεσσιν in place of Τρώεσσιν) that increases the power of the descendants of Aeneas (the Romans), thereby extending it worldwide⁴⁷.

Sch. b (BCE³) T ad Φ 577 (ex.): καὶ περὶ δουρὶ πεπαρμένη <οὐκ ἀπολήγει>: φησὶν Ἡρακλέων (fr. 15 Berndt) ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῦτο τεθεᾶσθαι. ὁ δὲ βαλὼν, φησί, τὸ πάλιον, ὃ περιέκειτο, ἐτέρω περιέθηκεν ὠπλισμένω καὶ ἀκμῇτι, ὅπως ἐπ' ἐκείνον τραπήῃ.

Agenor, albeit afraid of the imminent clash with Achilles, does not want to escape before challenging him. He awaits the battle in the same way as an injured panther awaits his hunter and his destiny.

The exegetic scholium contains evidence provided by the grammarian Heracleon (active as a teacher in Rome between the Ist century B.C. and the Ist century A.D.)⁴⁸ that illustrates an analogy between the Homeric simile described and Roman gladiatorial use: after the first contest between a gladiator and a wild beast, the man would throw a πάλιον (Latin *pallium*)⁴⁹ – a type of cloak he had worn until then to make him observable to the animal – to another gladiator, armed ready for combat,

modified in a pro-Roman direction at an earlier stage, during the height of the Hellenistic age between the end of the IIIrd and the beginning of the IInd centuries B.C. It is no accident that this is the period of Flamininus' campaign in Greece, during which, as is known, though formally granting Greece independence (196 B.C.), Flamininus in fact laid the foundations for Roman power over Hellas. It is logical to suppose therefore that in this phase there were episodes of adulation towards the new rulers, this pro-Roman correction of the Homeric text being an example. The ancient nature of the conjecture appears to be confirmed by the opposing interpretation given by Dionysius of v. 307 with πάντεσσιν (1.53.4–5): the Aeneads, it is suggested, reigned over the Trojans who Aeneas had led to another territory (i.e. Latium) and not necessarily over the Trojans in the Troad.

46 Razzetti 2003a.

47 For a discussion on the complex nature of the ancient exegesis relating to the passage, see Erbse's apparatus *ad loc.*

48 Ippolito 2005.

49 The Greek authors who use this word of Latin origin normally use the form πάλιον; πάλιον in the scholium is probably an error.

so as to turn the beast's attention to the new target. We find, also here, a parallel between Homeric and Roman usage, although it should be pointed out that the ideological intention is less clear than in the other cases. The observation regarding gladiatorial customs may be simply due to a random association between the Homeric image and this particular Roman circus game, and need not imply the reasoning used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and many other exegetes of his time, namely: this Roman custom can already be found in Homer, therefore the Romans have Greek origins. Since scholia are the result of a long process of abridgment and rewriting, it is perfectly possible that some words or some part of the reasoning went lost; consequently this scholium, in the form we have it, is only in part useful for this research. However, it is worth mentioning because it is an account of the Roman circus game given to us by a grammarian, Heracleon, who was active at the height of the Augustan age. It is also significant that the grammarian seems to have been influenced, above all in the area of etymology, by the grammatical theories of Philoxenus and that the surviving evidence suggests that Heracleon had contacts with Epaphroditus. Both elements would confirm that Heracleon was a member of Rome's cultural *milieu* in the Augustan age and suggest that he may have been familiar with the theory of the Greek origin of the Romans, even though the scholium in question contains no significant evidence to this effect.

Sch. T *ad* Ω 100 *b* (ex.): ἡ δ' ἄρα παρ Διὶ πατρὶ <καθέζετο, εἶξε δ' Ἀθήνη>: ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὡς φησι Πίνδαρος (fr. 146 Snell): “πῦρ πνέοντος ἅ τε κεραυνοῦ / ἄγχιστα δεξιᾶν κατὰ χεῖρα πατρός / ἴζεαι”. καὶ ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ δὲ οὕτως ἴδρυται ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ.

Zeus summons Thetis and asks her to convince her son Achilles to return the body of Hector to his father, Priam. The nymph appears before the father of the gods and sits at his side in the place vacated for her by Athena.

The exegetic scholium to verse 100, after having quoted a passage of Pindar, draws attention to an analogy between the position of Athena (and Hera) at Zeus' side on Olympus and the position the goddess Minerva takes in the famous Capitoline triad, where Hera and Minerva are, respectively, on the left and right of Iupiter. No reference is made to a specific exegete but it has been proposed, albeit unconvincingly, that the analogy can be attributed to the previously mentioned grammarian

Heracleon⁵⁰. In any case, I believe that the scholium reveals an intent to highlight similarities between the Homeric/Greek world and Rome.

This collection of references to *res Romanae* in the scholia to the *Iliad*, highlights, with some caution in the case of the scholium to Φ 577, that the other four may contain a line of continuity between the Homeric and Roman worlds, as if some would seek to find a similarity between Roman and Homeric customs or, more precisely, a Homeric (i.e. Greek) antecedent to those adopted in Rome: the conventional use of the word ἄρμα to indicate not only chariot but also armour, from the Latin *arma* (*sch. ad B* 384 and Eust. 243.14 *ad loc.*); the custom of jumping from one moving horse to another (*sch. ad O* 683–684); the analogy between the position of Athena on Olympus and the position of Minerva in the Capitoline triad (*sch. ad Ω* 100 *b*). The scholia to Y 307–308 *a*¹, *a*² and to Y 307 *a*¹ directly address the debate regarding Rome's possible Trojan origins, thereby giving space to one of the principal theories that connect the origins of the *Urbs* to the Greek-Homeric world⁵¹.

The most important element relevant to the purpose of the present research is the fact that the sources of at least three of the just mentioned scholia were Greek grammarians active during the Augustan age in Rome (Demetrius Gonypesus or Epaphroditus, Heracleon, Aristonicus), namely the time and place in which, as we have seen, many supported the Greek origin of the *Quirites* and in which Rome presented itself as the maximum expression of ancient Greek culture.

Moreover, out of five scholia or groups of scholia highlighting the relation between the Greek world and *romanitas*, five are *scholia exegetica*, transmitted by the manuscripts bT (with the partial exception only of the scholium to Y 307 *a*¹, found in *Venetus A*). This may not be a coincidence if we take into account that the exegetic scholia reflect the terminology and critical conventions in fashion between the Ist century B.C. and the IInd century A.D., roughly the period in which the theory of Rome's Greek origins was prevalent⁵². It is possible therefore that one of the sources of these scholia can be placed in the Augustan age and for

50 See Valk 1963–1964, I 437, who suggests that, as Heracleon is cited in the scholium to Φ 577 as to the question of a particular Roman usage, one can see his presence also in the scholium to Ω 100 solely because also this illustrates evidence regarding the Roman world.

51 See *supra*, § 1.

52 Erbse 1960, 173; Richardson 1980, 265: «But it seems likely that the majority of the exegetical Scholia ... derive from scholars at the end of the Hellenistic and the beginning of the Roman period, who were consolidating the work of earlier critics»; Dickey 2007, 19: «[The bT scholia] contain some Alexandrian material (much of it attributable to Didymus) ...».

this reason it was influenced by the above mentioned theory. As a consequence, it is no accident that nearly all the scholia containing a comparison between the Greek and Roman worlds are exegetical, a fact that provides further support to the position presented in this paper⁵³.

2.2. Scholia to the *Odyssey*

The scholia to the *Odyssey* contain only one reference that is relevant to the purposes of this research⁵⁴:

Sch. QVHPT *ad* η 90: κορώνη] τὸ ἐπίσπαστρον τῆς θύρας, ἦτοι τὸ κρίγκιον. QV κορώνη τὸ κρικίον. P κορώνη ἐπὶ τοῦ ζώου καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόξου καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς πρύμνης τοῦ πλοίου, διὰ τὸ ἐπικαμπὲς σχῆμα. εἴρηται δὲ ταῦτα ἀπὸ τοῦ ζώου τῆς κορώνης. εὐλύγιστον γὰρ ἔχει ὅσον εὐκαμπῇ τὸν τράχηλον. καὶ παρὰ μέρος σώματος ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀγκῶνος. οὕτω Φιλόξενος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου (fr. 315 Theodoridis). HPT

The entrance of Odysseus to the court of Alcinoüs is preceded by a detailed description of the latter's palace: the doors were made of gold, the door jambs and architrave were of silver, the threshold of bronze and the door hooks of gold (vv. 88-90). The scholium concentrates on the term used by Homer to denote the eyelet through which probably a rope was passed to form a handle, κορώνη. The source of the scholium is Philoxenus, the grammarian mentioned previously who in his work on the dialect of the Romans maintained that Latin was a derivation from Greek⁵⁵. Philoxenus believed that the term κορώνη denoted a series of curved objects, such as the top of an arch, a door bolt, the stern of a ship, an elbow. They are in fact extensions of the primary meaning of κορώνη, i.e. "crow", a bird with a curved neck. The scholiast does not offer further examples, but given the source we can reasonably assume that Philoxenus compared the Greek term κορώνη with the Latin one, in an attempt to show the derivation of the latter from the former. The most likely hypothesis is that Philoxenus, in a now lost section of the scholium, identified the Greek κορώνη as the origin of the Latin

53 On exegetical scholia in general, see Erbse 1960, 171ff.; Valk 1963-1964, I 414-535; Schmidt 1976; Richardson 1980; Kirk 1985, 40; Dickey 2007, 19-20; Cadoni 2010, 28 and n. 81, with further references.

54 For two further citations of the Romans in the scholia to the *Odyssey* which are not relevant to this research, see *supra* n. 31.

55 See *supra*, § 1.

word *corona*⁵⁶, which denotes a completely rounded object and, similarly to the Greek term, is used with several meanings. In fact in Latin *corona*, as well as indicating various types of regal headwear, was also used in the sense of circle, ring or circuit, margin. Philoxenus may have used this etymology to support the proposition that Latin derived from Greek⁵⁷.

Also this evidence from the scholia to the *Odyssey* can be seen as part of a line of thought that attempted to identify (if not actually create) a direct link between the Greek and Roman worlds and its significance is heightened by the fact that, thanks to the presence of Philoxenus, it can be traced back to the Rome of the Augustan age and is directly connected to the theory that Latin was a Greek dialect.

3. *POxy.* 3710

An evidence of considerable interest, which has so far not received the attention it deserves, is a papyrus (*POxy.* 3710) thought to be of the late IInd century A.D. with a commentary, in four consecutive columns, of around 170 verses (vv. 105–276) on book XX of the *Odyssey*, edited for the first time in 1986 by Michael W. Haslam and probably written in the Ist century A.D., i.e. the period in which the theory of the Greek origins of the Romans was at its height⁵⁸.

56 See Chantraine 1968–1980, *s.v.* κορώνη.

57 See Giomini 1953, 373–374. It is likely that the grammarian Apion (20 B.C.–45 A.D.), though proposing a different etymology, followed the line adopted by Philoxenus (active shortly before him) and attributed Greek origins to Latin, given that in the *Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς διαλέκτου* he suggests that the ancient name for “crown” was *χορωνός* (which for Apion was the antecedent of the Latin *corona*), owing to the fact that it was worn by the choreutae (*χορευταί*): Apion in Jacoby, *FGrHist* 616 F 25 (= Ath. 15.680d): ΧΟΡΩΝΟΝ. Ἀπίων ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς διαλέκτου φησὶν τὸν στέφανον πάσαι χορωνὸν καλούμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς χορευτὰς ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις αὐτῷ χρῆσθαι, αὐτοὺς τε περικειμένους καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀγωνιζομένους, καθὼς ἐν τοῖς Σιμωνίδου Ἐπιγράμμασιν ἰδεῖν ἔστιν οὕτως καλουμένου· Φοῖβον, ὃς ἀγέεται <τοῖς> Τυνδαρίδῃσιν αἰοιδᾶς, ἀμέτεροι τέττιγες ἐπεστέφαντο χορωνῶ. On this passage by Apion, see Dubuisson 1984, 61 and 1987, 20. See also Hsch. κ 3739 Latte, *s.v.* κορώνη: κορώνη· κόραξ. καὶ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ τόξου, εἰς ὃ ἡ νευρὰ δέδεταί (Δ 111). καὶ ὁ κρίκος τῆς θύρας (α 441). καὶ τὸ ζῶον. καὶ ὄρνεον. καὶ ἰχθῦς. καὶ λάρος. καὶ εἶδος στεφάνου. On the latter meaning, Latte compares a fragment of Sophron (Vth century B.C.; fr. 162 K.–A.: κορώνας ἀνδούμενοι) which he believes to have been the source of Hesychius.

58 The papyrus (MP³ 1212.01; LDAB 1690; CPP 0497) is extremely important for the studies of ancient Homeric erudition as it cites glossographers (Parmeno

At dawn, on the day when Odysseus is to take revenge on the Suitors, Eurycleia orders the handmaids to prepare the banquet hall quickly, to lay out the rugs and polish the dishes. Homer provides an explanation of these actions through the words of the aged wet nurse: «The suitors shall not stay for long distant from the palace, / but shall soon come, as the feast is for all» (vv. 155–156)⁵⁹. The Homeric text is clear: the work of cleaning and tidying that Eurycleia orders the handmaids to perform is due to the imminent arrival of the Suitors. As regards this passage, on the contrary, the author of the commentary, after having quoted as *lemma* the beginning of v. 151 (col. II, ll. 27–28: β[άλ]λετε | π[ορ]φ[υρ]έους αἱ δέ), makes a surprising and apparently unjustified observation: ταῦτα οὐ φ[ρ]οντίζου|σα λέγει τῶν μνηστῆρων ἀλλ' ὅπως | μεταβῶσιν ταχέως ἐπὶ τὴν τα[λ]ασιουργίαν (ll. 28–31). According to the unknown exegete, Eurycleia's instructions to the handmaids to work quickly is not due to the imminent arrival of the Suitors, but because she wants them to finish this work so that they can dedicate themselves to spinning wool (ταλασιουργία), of which in fact there is no trace in the Homeric passage⁶⁰. The commentator himself however provides us with the grounds on which his reasoning is probably based (l. 31): Ῥωμαϊκὸν τὸ ἔθος τῆς διακ[ο]νίας, which literally means «the custom of (this) service is Roman»: in other words in Rome the spinning of wool is an activity carried out by servants. I do not accept Haslam's translation⁶¹ «Service is a Roman custom», as it may lead to a misunderstanding of the passage. In fact, by stressing the concept of διακονία (translated with «service»), Haslam seems to suggest

of Byzantium) and grammarians of both the Alexandrian school (Aristophanes of Byzantium and later Aristonicus), and the so-called Pergamene school (Crates and Zenodotus of Mallus). See Broggiato 2001 [= 2006], 232. The following are also mentioned for questions relating to astronomy: Thales, Heraclitus of Ephesus, Aristarchus of Samus and Diodorus (of Alexandria?). The papyrus can be viewed at www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk, whilst bibliographical references are provided at cpp.arts.kuleuven.be.

59 Οὐ γὰρ δὴν μνηστῆρες ἀπέσσονται μεγάροιο, / ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἤρι νέονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ πᾶσιν ἑορτή. The feast in question is probably that of Apollo *Neomenios*, which occurred on the first day of every month. See Russo 1993⁴, 271 and Razzetti 2002, 225–226.

60 Haslam 1986, 106, *ad* col. II, ll. 28–31: «The commentator is anxious to assign a worthy motive for her urgings – not (as had been charged?) a concern for the comfort of the suitors, but a concern to have the servant-women return as quickly as possible to their wool-work within the palace». The hand-women of the palace of Odysseus dedicate themselves to wool-work in only two passages: σ 313–316 and χ 421–423.

61 Haslam 1986, 106, *ad* col. II, l. 31.

that in general the use of slaves and not their handiwork in wool was a typically Roman custom, which of course it was not. Haslam, furthermore, fails to highlight what is in my view the most striking element in this passage of the commentary: it is clear that the observation as to the *τάλασιουργία* carried out by the handmaids, which is wholly unjustified in this context, is a forced interpretation and a part of an attempt to read into the passage a connection between Greek and Roman customs. The author of the commentary clearly wishes to establish a parallel in order to exploit the passage for his own purposes, highlighting that the spinning of wool was carried out by slaves in both the Homeric and Roman worlds. It is extremely likely that the exegete refers to an already ancient Roman custom involving slaves, the *pensum*, i.e. the quantity of wool that was assigned to the female slaves (*quasillariae*) each day for spinning. In spite of the fact that in time the meaning of the word was extended to include the spinning of wool by female slaves and freed or free women alike⁶², originally in Rome the spinning of wool was a menial task performed by slaves⁶³. By assigning the work of *τάλασιουργία* to the handmaids of the palace of Ithaca, the commentator clearly wished to compare them to Roman slaves and by so doing joined those who sought a similarity between Homeric (i.e. Greek) and Roman customs. Confirmation of this hypothesis comes from the fact that, as literary sources reveal, the *τάλασία* or *τάλασιουργία* was in the Greek world a woman's task that was not exclusively carried out by slaves⁶⁴, as it was the case in the Roman world. The Romans, therefore, on the basis of the reconstruction made by the exegete of *POxy.* 3710, had preserved an ancient custom, witnessed by Homer, which was lost by the Greeks. This is exactly the same line of reasoning adopted, as we have seen, by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

Haslam rightly points out that our anonymous commentator worked at the same time as Aristodemus of Nysa (Caria), rhetorician and grammarian of the Ist century A.D. summoned to Rome by Pompeius, and supporter of the theory that Homer was Roman. Such a position was based on the similarities between certain practices mentioned in the two poems and some typically Roman *ἔθη*⁶⁵: the game of *πρῆστοί* (α 107) and the custom of standing up in the presence of those of higher social

62 Chiabà 2003 and Petraccia 2003, both with notes providing extensive references.

63 Hug 1924; 1937, which quotes numerous Latin sources on the *pensum*, mostly poetic; Petraccia 2003 with references; Pekridou-Gorecki 2009, 344.

64 See e.g. Pl. *Lg.* 805e; X. *Mem.* 3.9.11; Plu. *Rom.* 15. Among recent studies on the question, see Andò 2005, 39 with references at note 42.

65 Haslam 1986, 106, *ad col.* II, l. 31. See *supra* nn. 11 and 12.

position or rank, regardless of age (β 14 and A 533)⁶⁶. It can reasonably be supposed therefore that the author of the commentary found in *POxy.* 3710 was influenced by the theory proposed by Aristodemus of Nysa⁶⁷.

In short, my interpretation differs from Haslam's insofar I believe that the author of the *hypomnema* strained the meaning of the Homeric text in order to emphasise allegedly Roman features which should have proved the Roman origins of the first and most prestigious Greek poet.

4. Conclusions

The examination of the scholia to Homer and the comment in *POxy.* 3710 regarding *ταλασιουργία*, taken together with the text of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and with an analysis of the doctrine of Aristodemus of Nysa, allows us to formulate a precise framework that is substantially consistent with the ideological position adopted by Rome in the age of Augustus in its relations with the Greek world. What emerges is that the various "voices" examined in this research (Dionysius, the grammarians quoted in the Homeric scholia, the author of the commentary kept in the papyrus and Aristodemus of Nysa) not only have Greek origins in common, but also belonged to Roman society in a historical phase when the subject of relations with the Greeks was at the centre of the ideological, political and cultural attention of the ruling class. Although

66 *Vit. Hom.* 6.18–23 Allen: Ἀριστόδημος δ' ὁ Νυσαεὺς (*FHG* III 307) Ῥωμαῖον αὐτὸν ἀποδείκνυσιν ἔκ τινων ἑθῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις μόνον γινομένων, τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τῆς τῶν πεσσῶν παιδιᾶς, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπανίστασθαι τῶν θάκων τοὺς ἥσσανας τῶν βελτίστων ἐκόντας, ἃ καὶ νῦν ἔτι φυλάσσεται παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἔθῃ. This passage is very probably the source of the *Suda* (*s.v.* Ὀμηρος, ο 251 Adler), which presents the poet's Roman origins as one of the twenty found in ancient sources and cited in the entry. Robert 1940, 148 quotes the passage from the *Vita* with three variants which do not, however, modify the overall meaning. Dubuisson 1987, 23, is convincing in his view that very probably Aristodemus used considerably more than two Homeric examples in support of his theory; these examples however have never come down to us. For discussions on Aristodemus in general, see Hillscher 1892, 377–379; Schwartz 1895; Knaack 1903; Dubuisson 1987, 16–19; Ascheri 2010; on the theory of Homer as a Roman, see Susemihl 1891–1892, II 184; Hillscher 1892, 435–439; Dubuisson 1987, in particular 22–23.

67 The influence exerted by the theory of Aristodemus on the exegete might suggest also that the latter lived in a Roman *milieu* (Haslam 1986, 106, *ad col.* II, l. 31). On the basis of current evidence, however, this must remain a hypothesis, albeit an attractive one.

the various sources referred to in this work are characterised by differing approaches and points of view, they share the same way of thinking which, influenced by the higher echelons of Roman society, sought some form of conciliation between the Greek and Roman worlds.

On the one side, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Greek grammarians mentioned in the Homeric scholia which cite *res Romanae*, Greek intellectuals active in Rome between the Ist century B.C. and the Ist century A.D., with the aim of promoting acceptance of Roman domination amongst the Greeks, tried to show that the Roman conquerors were in fact of Greek origin and that even their language, Latin, derived from Greek. It was hoped in this way that, given their shared ethnic and linguistic ancestry, the Greeks would accept Roman power more readily⁶⁸. The grammarians' attempts to find the Homeric roots (therefore Greek *par excellence*) of some Roman customs should be seen within this ideological context. A similar strategy enabled Dionysius and other grammarians to shed lustre on their Roman guests by attributing to them noble Greek origins. It should be recalled that Dionysius was strongly pro-Roman⁶⁹ and that many of the grammarians in question had been brought to Rome as slaves to be later freed thanks to the intervention by members of Rome's ruling class.

On the other side, some scholars wished to demonstrate Homer's Roman origins via the search for analogies between the Homeric and Roman worlds. Those known to us are the anonymous comment of *POxy.* 3710 and Aristodemus of Nysa: both worked in the period between the Ist century B.C. and the Ist century A.D. and both were Greek; the latter was certainly active in Rome, whilst the former was probably active in Rome, but certainly well-informed about the Roman world. Through the use of the concept of Homer's Roman roots, the exegete and the grammarian (the latter connected to Pompeius) tried to flatter the new dominators of the Mediterranean world by showing them that even the greatest of Greek poets was of Roman descent⁷⁰.

68 Dubuisson 1987, 21.

69 There is a debate between those who believe that Dionysius was a pro-Augustan historian and those who believe he was anti-Augustan. The major exponent of the latter position is the already cited Hill 1961, who maintains that, in supporting the Greek origins of Rome, Dionysius was in open contrast with the Emperor, who supported instead the Trojan origins of the city. A more moderate position is taken, amongst others, by Gabba 1982, 800-802 and Delcourt 2005, 363-369, who provides an overview of those supporting the two positions (364 n. 3).

70 Dubuisson 1987, 21: «... Aristodème intellectuel grec au service de Pompée, avait apporté sa pierre à l'édifice en soutenant que le plus ancien représentant

Two different concepts, i.e. the Greek origins of the Romans and the Roman origins of Homer, are in fact two sides of the same coin, since in both instances some intellectuals tried to find a connection between Homer, the Greek *par excellence*, and Rome. It may be said that both represent two facets of an attempt on the part of Augustan propaganda to create a global and unitary vision of the Greco-Roman world in which, on one hand, the Greeks accepted their Roman conquerors and, on the other, the Romans, having to integrate Greece in their universal *imperium*⁷¹, felt proud of their ancient Greek origins and saw Homer as “one of them”.

de la littérature gréco-latine, le plus grand écrivain de langue grecque, était en réalité un Romain – que l’œuvre de base de la culture et de l’éducation grecques venait de Rome».

71 See Delcourt 2005, 215–218.

Observations on *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* by Apollonius Dyscolus

Silvia Consonni

Four works by Apollonius Dyscolus have survived almost fully intact. In addition to *Περὶ συντάξεως* – a grammatical *summa* not only of the morphology of single parts of speech, but also of the potential relations existing between them within a proposition – three monographs exist dedicated, respectively, to pronominal, adverbial and connective elements of the Greek language: *Περὶ ἄντωνυμίας*, *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* and *Περὶ συνδέσμων*.

Apollonius' work, after an initial period of studies carried out towards the end of the XIXth century that saw the publication of the first modern editions¹, has become in recent decades the object of a considerable number of publications². However, in this resurgence of studies dedicated to the Alexandrian grammarian, one treatise – *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* – appears to have received little detailed examination, albeit for some sporadic commentaries³.

Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων immediately reveals a clear methodological structure in which each part of speech can be studied from two differing

English translation by Justin Rainey.

I wish to express my warm thanks to Antonietta Porro for her help in preparing this paper and to Albio Cesare Cassio for carefully reading my typescript and for his valuable advice.

- 1 I. Bekker's editions, published in the early years of the XIXth century, were followed, between 1878 and 1910, by those of R. Schneider and G. Uhlig in *Grammatici Graeci* (II/I; II/II; II/III).
- 2 See, as regards *Περὶ συντάξεως*, in addition to the translations of Buttmann 1877, Householder 1981 and Bécares Botas 1997, respectively in German, English, and in Spanish, the edition by Lallot 1997. This group of works is completed by the recent translation by Bednarski 2000. Recent publications of other works by Apollonius include an edition of *Περὶ συνδέσμων* by Dalimier 2001 and a lengthy study by Brandenburg 2005 on *Περὶ ἄντωνυμίας*, the first part of which was also edited by Maas 1911. For a bibliography of the editions of the works of Apollonius and related studies, see Pagani 2006a.
- 3 Sluiter 1990; Brocquet 2005.

but complementary perspectives, i.e. concept (ἔννοια) and form (σχῆμα τῆς φωνῆς)⁴. On the basis of this assumption, Apollonius Dyscolus organises his analysis of adverbs in four parts: firstly, a definition of the adverb accompanied by an explanation of the main concepts on which the definition itself is based⁵; the second part examines, on the basis of the theoretical principles previously presented, some linguistic elements of uncertain classification owing to their ambiguous grammatical status⁶; part three presents a detailed and lengthy analysis of the phonetic structure of adverbs⁷; finally, in the edition we have access to, there is a discussion regarding the syntax of adverbs of place⁸.

1. The limited number of publications that have in recent years discussed *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*⁹ have focused particularly on the first part of the work, in which, as we have seen, the definition of the adverb has primary importance: Ἔστιν οὖν ἐπίρρημα μὲν λέξις ἄκλιτος, κατηγοροῦσα τῶν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐγκλίσεων καθόλου ἢ μερικῶς, ὧν ἄνευ οὐ κατακλείσει διάνοιαν¹⁰. This complex, well-structured definition contains important ideas as regards the Apollonian concept of the category of adverbs.

Above all, it is important to note that in this definition the adverb is indicated with the term λέξις, used here in the sense of μέρος λόγου. Apollonius Dyscolus, thereby, assigns the adverb the status of an autonomous part of speech; more precisely, the adverb represents one of the eight parts of speech that make up a proposition, namely ὄνομα (noun), ῥήμα (verb), μετοχή (participle), ἄρθρον (article), ἄντωνυμία (pronoun) and πρόθεσις (preposition), while σύνδεσμος (conjunction) is given a special status (§ 28)¹¹. The adverb is also marked, as highlighted by the presence of the adjective ἄκλιτος, as an indeclinable part of speech¹². This feature, examined by Apollonius via the use of numer-

4 *Adv.* 119.1-4.

5 *Adv.* 119.5-126.24.

6 *Adv.* 126.24-145.25.

7 *Adv.* 146.1-200.32.

8 *Adv.* 201.1-210.5. As to the hypotheses regarding the fourth and final part, see Schneider 1845; Egger 1854, 19-21; Lallot 1997, I 38-41.

9 See *supra*, n. 3.

10 *Adv.* 119.5-6: «The adverb is therefore an indeclinable part of speech which refers, wholly or in part, to verbal forms, without which – verbal forms – it gives no complete sense».

11 *Synt.* 13.1-28.13.

12 *Adv.* 119.7-120.18.

ous examples grounded on conventional linguistic practice and rational arguments, is immediately flanked by a syntactic characteristic.

In fact, whilst the noun and verb perform a fundamental role within the proposition (θεματικώτερα <μέρη> τοῦ λόγου¹³), the adverb together with the other parts of speech has an optional function as without it the sentence continues to be grammatically and therefore semantically complete¹⁴. It follows that the adverb requires a verb in order to justify its presence within the proposition (κατηγοροῦσα τῶν ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐγκλίσειον)¹⁵. Also the sense of the expression that concludes the definition is clear (ὧν ἀνευ οὐ κατακλείσει διάνοιαν): the adverb, despite having, unlike a preposition and conjunction, its own meaning¹⁶, cannot translate this semantic autonomy into a syntactic one¹⁷. The definition of the adverb closes with a brief comment (καθόλου ἢ μερικῶς) which is analysed in considerable detail in the discussion that follows¹⁸: the syntax of adverbs is characterised by various restrictions; for instance, the adverb ἐχθές, citing an example provided by Apollonius, can only appear in the presence of a past tense verb. It demonstrates that the syntactic relationship between an adverb and verb can be viewed as one in which the semantic component of the former meets the inflectionary features of the latter.

1.1. In this first part, Apollonius Dyscolus addresses the question of the position adverbs should occupy in a proposition and decisively rejects the hypothesis that an adverb may be found between an article and the noun to which the article refers (such as in the case: ὁ καλῶς ἀνθρώπος γράφει). In fact in this case the adverb would be surrounded by an extraneous category, i.e. gender¹⁹.

13 *Adv.* 121.5–6. The principal parts of speech are also defined by Apollonius ἐμψυχότατα (*Synt.* 28.6), to indicate that *per se vivunt et intelleguntur*; see Schneider 1902, 140.

14 *Synt.* 16.12–17.15.

15 *Adv.* 120.19–121.13.

16 *Synt.* 13.1–15.5.

17 *Adv.* 121.14–122.15.

18 *Adv.* 123.1–125.5.

19 *Adv.* 122.16–34. In this case a phrase without καταλληλότης would result. This word refers to the most important concept of the entire linguistic doctrine of Apollonius, who at the beginning of the Περὶ συντάξεως identifies the object of his analysis in καταλληλότης τοῦ αὐτοτελοῦς λόγου: this consists in the regularity and grammatical correctness that characterises a proposition when its components are compatible at both semantic and syntactic levels. A proposition is therefore grammatically correct if there is congruence between the παρυφιστάμενα (παρεπόμενα, συμβεβηκότα) of the various elements of

This question is examined further by Apollonius in an analysis of the etymology of the word ἐπίρρημα, which concludes the discussion regarding the concept of adverb²⁰. This section opens with a precise question: τί δὴ ποτε, εἰ καὶ ἐν ὑποτάξει ἐστὶ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα τοῦ ῥήματος καὶ ἐν προτάξει, ἀπὸ τοῦ προτετάχθαι τὴν ὀνομασίαν ἔλαβε;²¹.

On the basis of this question, we can deduce two things: if on one hand Apollonius appears convinced that the preposition ἐπί indicates within the term ἐπίρρημα the anteposition of the adverb to the verb (ἐπί - ῥῆμα), on the other, by comparing the theoretical indication contained in the etymon with usual linguistic practice according to which adverbs may be put also after the verb, he reveals an obvious inconsistency. An initial analysis therefore shows that the etymology of ἐπίρρημα is ill-equipped to handle the practical applications typical of this grammatical category. Apollonius Dyscolus, however, resolves the divergence generated between definition and linguistic usage by overturning the terms of the question; in fact, he attempts to demonstrate on two different grounds that the only appropriate construction for the adverb is anteposition. Above all, he compares the syntactic relationship existing between adverb and verb with the syntactic relationship existing between adjective and noun²²: the adverb precedes the verb just as the adjective precedes the noun. This position is not based solely on empirical analysis backed up by a series of examples coming from archaic epic poetry, but also on a rationally-based rule, i.e. where an adjective is an attribute of the noun, it always precedes it. This anteposition is responsible for the movement of the article away from its usual position²³. Apollonius concludes with a second demonstration based on evidence

which it is made up. These are the grammatical *accidentia* which, by determining the morphological structure of every word, contribute in expressing the σημαίνόμενον. See Blank 1982, 28-39.

20 *Adv.* 125.6-126.24.

21 *Adv.* 125.6-8: «Why, even though the adverb may be placed after or before the verb, has it taken the name from the anteposition?».

22 *Adv.* 125.22-126.1: ὥ λόγῳ οὖν καὶ τὰ ἐπιθετικά τῶν ὀνομάτων προηγέσθαι θέλει τῶν οἷς ἐπικείται, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ τὰ ἐπιρρήματα προηγέσθαι θέλει τῶν ῥημάτων («Therefore in the way adjectives usually precede the forms they accompany, so in the same way do adverbs usually precede verbal forms»). *Sch.* D.T., in GG I/III 95.21-23: Καὶ ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπίθετον ὄνομα ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασι ... τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἐπίρρημα ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν («What the adjective is with regard to nouns ... is what the adverb is with regard to the verb»). According to Sluiter 1990, 95, this comparison reveals the Stoic influence that Apollonius was exposed to during his original and autonomous development of the definition of the adverb.

23 *Adv.* 125.16-126.13.

termed by Brocquet as «de permutation»²⁴: interrogative adverbs always precede the verbs they refer to; where however these are substituted within an utterance by corresponding indefinite adverbs, these indefinite adverbs change position to after the verb. Such is inevitably the result of the enclitic nature of indefinite adverbs. Therefore, the construction of interrogatives indicates the regular position an adverb should take within the proposition, whilst the position of indefinite adverbs represents a species of hyperbaton determined by the absence of the accent²⁵. On this basis, we can deduce that, according to Apollonius, the etymology of the word ἐπίρρημα is by no means defective, but instead reveals the only regular construction the adverb category has: anteposition.

2. Having posed the question at the start of his examination as to the etymology of ἐπίρρημα, Apollonius Dyscolus, before proceeding on this particular subject²⁶, refers to what is in his opinion a similar case. He posits that the pronoun αὐτός can be placed both before or after other pronominal forms and yet be defined ἐπιταγματικός.

Πρὸς ὃ ἔστιν ὑπαντῆσαι ὅτι ὁμοίον ἔστι τῷ καὶ τὴν αὐτός ἀντωνυμίαν
ἐπιταγματικὴν καλεῖν. ἐπιτάσσεται²⁷ μὲν,
αὐτὸς ἐκὼν οἱ δῶκα (δ 649)
καὶ
αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται (I 249)·
ὑποτάσσεται δὲ οὕτως,
σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ μελέτω (O 231)·
καὶ ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν συντάξεως ἐπιταγματικὴ
ὠνόμασται. οὐδὲν οὖν κωλύει καὶ τὸ ἐπίρρημα τῇδε ἐσχηματῖσθαι²⁸.

Despite being a marginal issue in the work and one which is referred to only briefly, Apollonius believes that it is still capable of showing that, also within the appellative ἐπιταγματικός²⁹, the preposition ἐπί indi-

24 Brocquet 2005, 136–137.

25 *Adv.* 126.13–24.

26 See *supra*.

27 Προτάσσεται pro ἐπιτάσσεται K. Lehrs.

28 *Adv.* 125.8–16: «It is possibile to reply to this question by saying that it is equivalent to defining also the pronoun αὐτός ἐπιταγματικός. It can be placed both before (αὐτὸς ἐκὼν οἱ δῶκα [δ 649], αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται [I 249]) and after (σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ μελέτω [O 231]); and still, in virtue of its initial construction, be called ἐπιταγματικός. Nothing therefore prevents the adverb from being defined in this way».

29 In the writings of Apollonius the adjective ἐπιταγματικός is always used exclusively in reference to the pronoun αὐτός. For a complete summary of all the occurrences, see Schneider/Uhlig 1878–1910, III 205; on this point, see also the Appendix, *infra*.

cates an anteposition of the pronominal form, despite the fact that considerable evidence³⁰ would suggest that the pronoun αὐτός can be found in both constructions.

2.1. This position, however, appears to be contradicted by another Apollonian passage contained in *Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας*, a monograph dedicated entirely to the study of pronouns (Apollonius concentrates considerable attention to pronouns in *Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας* as well as in the second book of *Περὶ συντάξεως*); in the monograph, in fact, he writes:

Ἡ καλουμένη ἐπιταγματική ἀντωνυμία καὶ προτάσσεται καὶ ὑποτάσσεται,
αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθεν (I 249)·
σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ μελέτω (O 231)·
ἐπεκράτησε μέντοι τὸ τῆς ὑποτάξεως, ὃ καλεῖται ἐπιταγματικόν. ὃν τρόπον οὖν τὸ ἐπίρρημα καὶ πρότασσεται τῷ ῥήματι καὶ ὑποτάσσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἐτέρας συντάξεως, λέγω δὴ τῆς ὑποταγῆς, τὸ ὄνομα ἔλαβε, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡ προκειμένη ἐπιταγματική ἀντωνυμία. μή ποτε δὲ διὰ τοιοῦτόν τινα λόγον κατ' ἀμφοτέρας τὰς συντάξεις ἑνὸς τετύχηκεν ὀνόματος³¹.

30 Here, as elsewhere, Apollonius Dyscolus clarifies certain points of theory by making reference to Homeric poems. Numerous literary references appear not only in *Περὶ ἐπίρρημάτων* but throughout Apollonius' works. In fact, he refers to the body of ancient Greek literature as a whole, moving chronologically from Hesiod to Callimachus and including the mimes of Sophron, the monodic lyric of Sappho and Alcaeus, the choral lyric of Alcman and Bacchylides, the *Φαινόμενα* of Aratus and the tragedies of Euripides. However, the predominant role is undoubtedly occupied by Homer, defined simply as ὁ ποιητής. In fact, passages cited from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are significant not only in terms of the frequency with which they occur in the text, but also for the fact that they coincide almost completely with the vulgate in our possession. The constant reference to the Homeric text four centuries after the philological work of Aristarchus remains one of the distinguishing features of grammatical studies and confirms the fact that Alexandrian grammar started with the *ἐμπειρία* of the literary tradition. On this point, see D.T., in *GG I/I* 5.1–6.3. It should be remembered that the works of Apollonius also contain numerous original examples created to illustrate certain particular syntagmatic structures; these examples appear often refer to school life rather than other literary sources.

31 *Pron.* 116.1–10: «The pronoun called ἐπιταγματικός is placed before and after (αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθεν [I 249], σοὶ δ' αὐτῷ μελέτω [O 231]); postposition certainly is the predominant construction defined as ἐπιταγματικός. The way in which the adverb is placed before and after the verb and takes the name of postposition occurs also for the above-mentioned pronoun ἐπιταγματικός. Presumably, according to this assertion, even though the pronoun may make up both constructions, it has taken the name from only one of them».

From the passage above, it appears we are to deduce that amongst the possible constructions of the pronoun αὐτός – which may be placed both before and after, as is shown once again by the Iliadic verses cited – postposition prevails (ὑποταγή); in fact, in the light of this postposition the pronoun is defined ἐπιταγματικός. Apollonius then continues by introducing, in perfect parallel with the passages previously analysed of *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*, a comparison with the adverb. As with the pronoun αὐτός, the adverb is also called ἐπίρρημα, owing to the fact that it frequently follows the verb form to which it refers.

This position is in evident contradiction with that taken in *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*³²; in fact, it would appear that that preposition ἐπί, contained both in the adjective ἐπιταγματικός and the noun ἐπίρρημα, indicates, of the two syntactic constructions realizable by the pronoun and adverb within the proposition, only one alternative, i.e. postposition.

However, from the *apparatus criticus*, it can be noted that the word ὑποτάξεως³³ is in fact the product of a conjecture by Bekker which has substituted for the reading originally present in ms. A³⁴: προτάξεως. Skrzeczka, at the end of the XIXth century, had already suggested following the reading of the manuscript and by so doing making the only change to the text that appears sensible and necessary, namely, to substitute ὑποταγῆς³⁵ with προτάξεως. In this way, a solution is found to an apparently irresolvable problem. In fact, this change restores consistency with the analogous passage from *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*. Furthermore, the

32 See *supra*.

33 *Pron.* 116.5.

34 *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων*, together with *Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας* and *Περὶ συνδέσμων*, has been transmitted to us by one manuscript only, *Par. gr.* 2548. For a complete description of the manuscript, see De Gregorio 2000, 137–138. This manuscript, unanimously dated, from the time of Schneider to the present day (Lallot), to a period ranging from the XIth and XIIth centuries (see Schneider 1878, VIII; Uhlig 1910, XXIII; Lallot 1997, I 86), has been attributed, first by Cavallo 1980, 166 and then by De Gregorio 2000, 137, on an exclusively palaeographic basis, to the IX/Xth century. Cavallo also proposes along with a new dating that the manuscript can be counted amongst the numerous manuscripts made, prior to the Norman invasion, in the Sicily-Calabria area. Cavallo claims these books are poor in quality, with little or no ornamentation, and inexpertly made with defects in parchment and colour imperfections between the hair and flesh sides. They also present painstaking writings typical of working copies. Nevertheless, they represent the only, precious evidence of important grammatical works, including the monographs of Apollonius. See Cavallo 1980, 161 nn. 8, 166, 171, 186.

35 *Adv.* 116.7.

substitution recommended by Skrzeczka, besides respecting the need to correct inconsistencies in the Apollonian corpus wherever possible, also brings the sense of the entire passage more into line with the linguistic reality of Greek, where the adverb, although subject to possible postposition, more frequently precedes the verb it accompanies³⁶.

2.2. Having ascertained the sense attributed by Apollonius to the preposition ἐπί within both the noun ἐπίρρημα and the adjective ἐπιταγματικός, at this stage we can usefully examine some brief extracts from Priscian's *Institutiones*³⁷. In particular, in book XVII, entitled *De constructione*, in the course of a discussion concerning the pronoun *ipse* (i.e. the corresponding Latin form of the Greek pronoun αὐτός),

36 In proximity to this passage the Apollonian text presents other philological problems: Skrzeczka 1853, 22-24 suggested that together with the words already cited, a few lines on within the following paragraph προτάσσηται should be substituted with ὑποτάσσηται (116.10). Schneider rejects the suggestion stating that it would hinder the understanding of the words that follow, which are in fact illegible, and which Schneider however claims to be able to reconstruct on the basis of a passage from the scholia to Dionysius Thrax. He therefore does not accept this specific proposal and with it the two preceding it. The passage from the scholia with which Schneider believes he can reconstruct the missing pieces of the text is difficult to interpret, although the examples therein are explained as to general meaning by this conclusion: Εἰ δὲ καὶ προτάττεται καὶ ὑποτάσσεται, πῶς ἀπὸ μιᾶς συντάξεως μόνον ὠνομάσθη; Φαμέν οὖν ὡς ἡ ἐπὶ πρόθεσις δύο συντάξεων ἐστὶ σημαντική (see *sch.* D.T., in GG I/III 271.28-30). Finally, it is useful to point out that the reconstruction of the last passage (116.10-14) is even more complex as the entire extract (116.1-14), introduced by the expression in upper-case letters ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΣ, is placed at the end of f. 194, the last one of the entire manuscript. Schneider 1869, 592-596 goes so far as to suppose that this part in its entirety (116.1-14), together with the previous part relating to the first person singular reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ (113.17-115.27), this also introduced by an expression in capital letters, is not to be attributed to Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας. In the face of such a problematical textual situation, a more prudent approach appears more appropriate. Consequently, avoiding in its entirety the reading and exegesis of the last lines (116.10-14), I will focus here on the preceding paragraph, the only one that is legible and understandable.

37 Uhlig 1910, LI, referring to the position of Bekker, defines him «fidum Apollonii interpretem» and subsequently states (LXVIII): «Priscianum patet Apollonianorum scriptorum magnam partem non eo consilio in Latinum sermonem convertisse, ut Dyscolum illustraret, sed quia putabat non posse se melius institutiones grammaticas latinae linguae componere, quam si Graecum technographum quoad posset imitaretur».

the Latin grammarian explicitly refers to *Περὶ συντάξεως*³⁸ and explains why the pronoun is termed by Apollonius as *ἐπιταγματικός*.

“Ipse” additivum vel appositivum dicitur, quod Apollonius *ἐπιταγματικόν* nominat, non quod solum hoc pronomen aliis pronominibus vel etiam nominibus apponitur, sed quod frequentius quam alia, ut “ego ipse, tu ipse, ille ipse, Virgilius ipse, Cicero ipse”. Inveniuntur enim et alia pronomina appositiva [*id est ἐπιταγματικά*]: Virgilius:

ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena.

idem in bucolico:

nec tuus hic Moeris, nec viveret ipse Menalcas.

[...]

per excellentiam igitur hoc pronomen, id est “ipse”, quasi proprium, quod commune est multorum, appositionis nomen possidet³⁹.

In this passage Priscian, in a faithful paraphrase of Apollonius’ text, states that the pronoun *αὐτός* is defined *ἐπιταγματικός* because it accompanies, more than any other form, different pronominal elements. Priscian makes no contribution as to the meaning of the etymon of this appellative, but does offer a significant translation. In his version he opts for two rarely used Latin adjectives⁴⁰: *additivus* and *appositivus*, deriving, respectively, from the verbs *addo* and *appono*⁴¹. As is clear from the semantics of both verbs, the adjectives used by Priscian reveal that the pronoun *ipse* is juxtaposed with other pronominal forms. However, what is not specified is the position the pronoun takes with regards to these other pronominal elements. According to the Latin grammarian the syntagmatic structure of the Greek epithet *ἐπιταγματικός* points out a syntactic relationship generated between two different components of a statement, i.e. adverb and verb. He does not, however, explicitly identify in this structure the position these two forms should occupy within the proposition they belong to. Priscian’s interpretation of the

38 *Synt.* 267.6–268.10.

39 Priscian. *Inst.* 17.179.25–180.10: «The pronoun *ipse*, which Apollonius calls *ἐπιταγματικός*, is termed additive or appositive, not because this pronoun alone is added to other pronouns or also nouns, but because it does so more frequently than others, for example: *ego ipse* (I myself), *tu ipse*, *ille ipse*, *Virgilius ipse*, *Cicero ipse*. There are, in fact, other appositive pronouns (i.e. *ἐπιταγματικά*); in Virgil: *ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena*. In the *Bucolics*: *nec tuus hic Moeris, nec viveret ipse Menalcas*. ... Therefore this pronoun, i.e. *ipse*, has the name of apposition – which (the apposition) is common to many – for antonomasia, as if it were its own».

40 Perhaps more correctly one can say these are Priscianian *hapax*, as also the dictionaries (see *ThLL*, s.v.) refer solely to this passage by Priscian.

41 See *ThLL*, s.v.

Apollonian appellative is further confirmed by a passage from book XII of the *Institutiones*, which is entirely dedicated to the pronominal category. Herein, Priscian writes that the pronoun *ipse* is called by Greek grammarians ἐπιταγματικόν «quod vel subiungit vel subiungitur alteri pronomini»⁴². Therefore, accepting literally the words of Priscian, the pronoun αὐτός - *ipse* is thus termed by traditional Greek grammar because it “attaches” (“yokes”) or is “attached” to another pronominal form with no precise indication as regards its position. Consequently, the Latin grammarian interprets the preposition ἐπί as a sign of a generalised juxtaposition rather than of anteposition.

2.3. In conclusion, the examination of the value of ἐπιταγματικός cited by Apollonius Dyscolus, as always, in relation to the pronoun αὐτός in the first pages of the *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* with the aim of clarifying and, to a certain extent, justifying the sense of the word ἐπίρρημα, can be completed by a rapid collection of the frequency with which the verb ἐπιτάσσω⁴³, having the same root of the adjective ἐπιταγματικός, appears in the works of Apollonius. Occurrences of this verb in fact reveal the two different semantic meanings with which it is used by Apollonius: as was already shown in detail in the index of Schneider and Uhlig⁴⁴, the verb ἐπιτάσσω at times is used with the meaning of “to

42 Priscian. *Inst.* 12.580.13-15.

43 Chantraine 1968-1980, *s.v.* τάσσω: «‘placer, ranger des troupes en bataille, désigner, mettre dans un certain ordre, prescrire, exiger un paiement’ ...; nombreuses formes à préverbes: ἀπο- ‘mettre à part’, δια- ‘arranger, ordonner’, etc., ἐν-, ἐπί- ‘ordonner’, κατα- ‘arranger, prescrire’, μετα- ‘changer’, παρα- ‘ranger côte à côte’, προσ- ‘poster, prescrire’, συν- ‘ranger, organiser, composer, prescrire’, ὑπο- ‘placer derrière’, etc.; sur προστάσσω, ἐπιτάσσω, συντάσσω ‘ordonner’ avec plus de rigueur que κελεύω. ... Dans cette famille de mots, τάσσω, etc., signifie ‘placer’ mais avec un champ beaucoup plus restreint que τίθημι, etc. L’idée est celle de placer où il faut, selon une organisation, d’où d’une part l’importance de ces mots dans le vocabulaires administratif et militaire, de l’autre la signification fréquente de ‘ordre, prescription’, etc.». For a complete summary of the meanings given in the principal modern dictionaries, see the Appendix, *infra*.

44 See Schneider/Uhlig 1878-1910, III 205.

place before” as a synonym of προτάσσω⁴⁵, whilst on other occasions it appears to have a less precise meaning: “to place next or beside”⁴⁶.

3. In the light of both the interpretation of the verb ἐπιτάσσω by Priscian and its use by Apollonius Dyscolus, it is natural to ask why the latter wished to interpret the preposition ἐπί as having the meaning of *ante* not only in the adjective ἐπιταγματικός but also in the noun ἐπίρρημα. It is reasonable to suggest that the prepositional element in the word ἐπίρρημα can be viewed as a marker of the juxtaposition that links the adverb to the verb; no further explanations appear necessary. Moreover, with this more generic interpretation, Apollonius could have, whilst fully respecting the semantic value of ἐπί, included within the etymological meaning the complete range of occurrences that the adverb can have in common linguistic practice thereby avoiding recourse to a complex and highly structured argumentation designed to re-establish consistency between etymological meaning and everyday language.

3.1. The position taken by Priscian can be useful also in this case. The Latin grammarian, who dealt with the adverbial category in book XV of *Institutiones*, does not offer any insight into the position an adverb should occupy in a proposition⁴⁷, but speaks of the adverb, within the definition placed at the beginning of the book, as being *verbis additum*⁴⁸, because, as

45 It is precisely with this meaning that the verb ἐπιτάσσω is used in *Adv.* 125.9; see also *Conj.* 222.18–19. On the other hand, on other occasions it appears to have a meaning close to ὑποτάσσω: see *Pron.* 34.10–11. Modern dictionaries apparently have identified only this meaning of ἐπιτάσσω; see the Appendix, *infra*.

46 *Synt.* 267.6–268.1. On this point Schneider 1902, 145 writes: «... optimo iure concludas ἐπιτάσσεσθαι esse apud Ap. ‘praeponi’, eis certe locis, ubi ὑποτάσσεσθαι verbo apponitur ... ubi non opponitur, ἐπιτάσσεσθαι ἐπικεῖσθαι est notione latius patente apponi».

47 He recognises, as regards the syntax of adverbs, a clear preponderance of anteposition, without however establishing a relationship of dependency between the most widely occurring syntactic constructions and the etymology of the adverb. See Priscian. *Inst.* 15.89.14–90.4. On the interpretation offered by Priscian, Matthias 1883, 43 writes: «... quaestio de ordine adverbiorum non particula est maioris de nomine adverbii disputationis, sed nova et peculiaris per se quaestio».

48 See Priscian. *Inst.* 15.60.2–5: «Adverbium est pars orationis indeclinabilis, cuius significatio verbis adicitur. Hoc enim perficit adverbium verbis additum, quod adiectiva nomina appellativis nominibus adiuncta, ut “prudens homo prudenter agit, felix vir feliciter vivit”». («The adverb is an indeclinable part of speech, whose meaning is added to verbs. In fact, the addition of an adverb to a verb

once again the translation shows with immense clarity, the adverb flanks the verb and in so doing completes its meaning.

3.2. In attempting to understand the reason why Apollonius decided to adopt this more complex approach to explain the etymological meaning of the terms ἐπίρρημα and ἐπιταγματικός, we have to investigate the ultimate objectives of his linguistic theories, starting from the most general considerations that can be deduced from the previous argumentation.

As the passages analysed so far show, Apollonius refers regularly and systematically to the rich Greek literary heritage; he does so not in order to offer philological comments on the pericopes cited, but so as to exemplify more effectively, whatever the theme in discussion may be, the linguistic phenomena being examined⁴⁹. The Alexandrians, by means of a constant comparison with the literary texts, were able to perceive the existence of morphological regularity, if not develop it within a theoretical framework⁵⁰. In achieving this, they made a fundamental contribution in the advancement of grammatical thought. However, in the IInd century A.D., the period in which Apollonius Dyscolus lived and worked, the τέχνη γραμματική, though still preserving significant traces of the different approaches and objectives which had strongly influenced its development⁵¹, was by now an autonomous discipline equipped with its own scientific rules. Apollonius himself, in fact, in defining linguistic purity (ἐλληνισμός) did not use solely the literary tradition (παράδοσις), but also addressed the language of everyday (συνήθεια)

produces the same effect as the addition of an adjective to a noun, as *prudens homo prudenter agit, felix vir feliciter vivit*»).

49 See *supra*, n. 30.

50 On this point see Matthaios 1999, *passim*.

51 See *Synt.* 51.7-12: καθάπερ οὖν παμπολλὸς ἐστὶν ἡ εὐχρηστία τῆς κατὰ τὸν Ἑλληνισμόν παραδόσεως, κατορθοῦσα μὲν τὴν τῶν ποιημάτων ἀνάγνωσιν τὴν τε ἀνὰ χεῖρα ὁμιλίαν, καὶ ἔτι ἐπικρίνουσα τὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις θέσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων, τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ ἡ προκειμένη ζήτησις τῆς καταλληλότητος τὰ ὅπωςδὴποτε διαπεσόντα ἐν λόγῳ κατορθώσει («Therefore, just as the correct use of Greek tradition is fundamental since it provides the criteria to correct both the reading of poems and everyday conversation and allows us to understand the sense of words used by the Ancients, so this present investigation into grammatical correctness will enable us to correct any error within a discourse»). On this point, Lallot 1987, 156 writes: «... le texte, en dernière analyse, est le maître suprême du philologue-grammairien comme du grammairien-philologue». Moreover, not to be underestimated is the fundamental influence philosophical enquiries into the origins of language and the semantics of language had on the development of grammar as a distinct area of study.



and its occurrences with an empirical approach. As the passage from *Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων* clearly shows, Apollonius Dyscolus, however, does not rely exclusively on evidence generated by conventional linguistic practice, but verifies by means of a demonstration (*ἀπόδειξις*) which of this evidence finds true logically-based support⁵². Apollonius applies the same process also to occurrences regarding adverbs: of the two constructions usually adopted in the language in use, only anteposition, which is rationally based, represents the distinct syntactic feature of the adverbial category. Only anteposition in fact, in conformity with the general rule in Greek whereby “modifiers come before the words they modify”⁵³, satisfies a linguistic model dominated by a logical-rational order (*τάξις*) that allows Apollonius to establish relations amongst the parts of speech and more generally relations amongst the different hierarchical levels that make up the language⁵⁴. Apollonius Dyscolus interprets therefore in accordance with this linguistic concept also the etymon of the word *ἐπίρρημα*, underlining in it – the etymon – the significance of anteposition, which is the only legitimate syntactic structure for adverbs and the only structure capable of capturing the rationale according to which adverbial elements and, with them, all other parts of speech are placed within a proposition⁵⁵.

Conversely, postposition, lacking theoretical support, is treated as a hyperbaton. Apollonius, aware of the complexity that a linguistic system can present in its various settings (from the stylistic-grammatical features of an author to specific dialectal characteristics that *koine* Greek in those

52 See Blank 1982, 11–14.

53 See Blank 1982, 48

54 These levels are perfectly isomorphic: as letters (*στοιχεῖα*) make up syllables (*συλλαβαί*) and syllables make up words (*λέξεις*), so the congruence of the thoughts underlying the words (*καταλληλότης τῶν νοητῶν*) determines the construction of a sentence with complete sense (*αὐτοτελής λόγος*). This structural similarity becomes the condition on the basis of which one could apply the criterion of analogy. Apollonius, in fact, often makes comparisons both between elements belonging to the same hierarchical level and between elements belonging to different linguistic levels.

55 See *sch.* D.T., in GG I/III 273.16–20: Διὰ τὶ δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος καὶ προτασσόμενον καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον μόνον ἐπίρρημα ἐκλήθη; Καί φαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ τῆς μιᾶς συντάξεως τῆς κυριωτέρας· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὑποτάσσεται τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ἀλλ’ ὅμως ἡ γνησίᾳ αὐτῶν σύνταξις προτέρα, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἐπίθετα πρότερά ἐστι ὀνομάτων καθ’ ὧν ἐπικείται. («Why, if it can come before or after the verb, was it called only ἐπίρρημα? Because it has taken the name of the more important syntactic structure; if in fact it comes after verbs, the legitimate syntax however between these is the first, just as adjectives precede the verbs they accompany»).

times still had), does not classify this syntactic construction as an error (ἄμαρτία), but more cautiously as a pathological variant (πάθος)⁵⁶.

Consequently, on one hand, Apollonius Dyscolus views in the technical-grammatical meaning of ἐπίρρημα the only syntactic construction really relevant to the adverbial category, anteposition, because it satisfies the analogical regularity that is, in his opinion, at the centre of linguistic structure as a whole. On the other hand, however, he does not ignore postposition, a construction which is also present, albeit less frequently, in language in use and in fact included in the broadest sense of the term. Apollonius claimed that postposition was an example of incorrect use or a pathological variation which, however, once studied and classified as such, ceases to represent an unacceptable anomaly as regards the rules governing the syntax of adverbs and more generally the natural order on which the linguistic system is based and the grammatical doctrine that is applied to it.

Finally, it is important to stress that, apart from single constructions, what emerges clearly from the etymology of ἐπίρρημα is the syntactic relation between adverb and verb. This is the new criterion on which Apollonius Dyscolus bases his grammatical enquiry in the Περὶ ἐπιρρημάτων. With Apollonius Dyscolus the adverb is no longer a “rag-bag” of words of uncertain classification⁵⁷, grouped together solely as a result of their morphological invariability, but a grammatical category with its own syntactic rules⁵⁸.

Appendix

Modern dictionaries and ancient grammatical terminology

The investigation into the concept of adverb and, in particular, the etymology of the word ἐπίρρημα by means of the analysis of different passages has provided the opportunity to focus on the use of certain terms – for instance, the verb ἐπιτάσσω and the adjective ἐπιταγματικός –

56 Lallot 1995a, 116 believes that Alexandrian grammar made a significant distinction when faced with the numerous irregularities that a language may present: on one hand, errors, «formes vicieuses jugées irrécupérables et donc exclues de la langue», on the other hand, the pathological variations, «formes réputées altérées, formes irrégulières à divers titres, mais qui vont cependant recevoir droit de cité dans la langue».

57 The expression is Kemp's (1991, 327).

58 As regards the supposed presence of the concept of “syntactic function” in the doctrine of Apollonius Dyscolus, see Donnet 1967, Lallot 1994.

within Apollonius' grammatical works. The situation that arises from this investigation is, due to its heterogeneousness, difficult to understand: the vocabulary appears to be semantically multi-layered with the primary sense of a word in everyday language being integrated by technical meanings that are not always precisely defined.

In such a situation it is natural to ask which interpretation is provided by modern dictionaries. I will try therefore to offer, by way of example, an overview of the meanings that these dictionaries present with regards to the two headwords mentioned above.

The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (*ThLG*), as regards the verb ἐπιτάσσω, identifies first and foremost a spatial semantic component in which the headword has the meaning of “to place after” (*colloco, dispono post*); the examples cited however refer exclusively to military practice, in particular to auxiliary troops called up to provide support to the army behind the front line⁵⁹. After this, there is a second range of meanings relating to the exercise of power: *pro potestate iubeo, pro imperio statuo, mando, impero, iubeo*. No grammatical meaning of the verb ἐπιτάσσω is taken into consideration, whilst considerable attention is placed on the grammatical meaning of the adjective ἐπιταγματικός. In order to clarify the semantic value of the term, a passage from Περὶ συντάξεως is cited, which is followed by Priscian's interpretation of the same passage⁶⁰: in conformity with the translations of the Greek appellative offered by Priscian (*impositivum, subiunctivum, and additivum and appositivum*), the *ThLG* indicates *subsidiarius* as the only meaning of ἐπιταγματικός.

Turning to Liddell-Scott-Jones' Greek-English dictionary (LSJ), as regards the verb ἐπιτάσσω, it can be seen that a dichotomy is maintained between the semantic areas of command, on one hand, and spatial placement on the other; however, the latter presents more varied shades in meaning (“to place next or beside”, “to place behind”) amongst which is identified the grammatical sense of “to place after”. In fact in a passage from Περὶ ἀντωνυμίας⁶¹ the examples provided appear to attribute the metalinguistic value of “to place after” to the verb ἐπιτάσσω and so LSJ assigns this specific meaning to the verb. It should be pointed out however that, though the primary grammatical meaning assigned to ἐπιτάσσω is “to place after”, the adjective ἐπιταγματικός

59 See *ThLG*, s.v.: «Ἐπιτεταγμένοι, qui in secunda acie dispositi sunt, i.e. Post primam aciem introrsus stationem et ordinem habentes».

60 See *Synt.* 267.6–268.10; as regards instead the Priscian's interpretation, see Priscian. *Inst.* 17.179.25–180.10.

61 *Pron.* 34.10–11: ἡ αὐτός πάση ἀντωνυμίᾳ ἐπιτάσσεται, ἐγὼ αὐτός, ἐκεῖνος αὐτός.

is provided with a generic meaning, i.e. “subsidiary”⁶² that has no specific sense of postposition. A further point of interest is that this dictionary is the only one to present, in relation to the headword under examination, an extract that does not belong either to Apollonius or the subsequent re-elaboration carried out by Priscian, but to a passage from *Περὶ τόνων* by Arcadius of Antioch⁶³.

Also Montanari’s Greek-Italian dictionary (GI), amongst the numerous meanings attributed to the verb ἐπιτάσσω (“ordinare”, “disporre dietro”, “mettere al comando”, “preporre”, “ordinare”, “comandare”, “ingiungere”, “usare l’imperativo”, “disporre”, “essere disposto o schierato dietro”), states that as a grammatical term it is used with the meaning of “essere collocato dopo”; the adjective ἐπιταγματικός, also in this work, is translated with the term “sussidiario”.

Lastly, in the glossary of grammatical terms that accompanies E. Dickey’s study of ancient Greek scholarship⁶⁴, the verb ἐπιτάσσω is translated by “to place after”, whilst several alternatives are offered for the adjective ἐπιταγματικός such as “subsidiary”, “appositive”, “post-positive”, with a reference made to J. Lallot’s edition of Apollonius’ *Syntax*⁶⁵.

I conclude with a comment on the headword with which I started this analysis: ἐπίρρημα. All the dictionaries examined state that this designates, on one hand, one of the *partes orationis*, whilst on the other, the part of a play recited after the parabasis; as Montanari’s dictionary (GI) underlines, in not strictly grammatical contexts, the meaning of ἐπίρρημα often coincides with that of “detto dopo”⁶⁶.

On the basis of this brief analysis, what appears is that while entries for the noun ἐπίρρημα are exhaustive and generally uniform, the situation regarding ἐπιτάσσω is deficient, especially as regards the different shades of meaning the verb has in grammatical contexts. Even more complex appears in this sense the translation of the adjective ἐπιταγματικός, which is substantially an Apollonian *hapax*, in which the meaning of the term is confused with the interpretation of the word provided by Apollonius in his works. What emerges clearly therefore is the semantic fluidity that characterises Apollonius’ vocabulary and the vocabulary of the coeval grammatical texts. In fact, there are many words that, taken from standard linguistic practice, undergo a complex

62 In this case the passages cited are: *Pron.* 45.12 and *Synt.* 267.6.

63 The passage in question is: *Arc.* 144.7; see Barker 1820.

64 Dickey 2007, 238.

65 Lallot 1997, II 157.

66 See Montanari, GI, *s.v.*

semantic development before arriving at, in those cases where this actually occurs, a precise technical meaning⁶⁷. The result is a multi-layered semantics which is difficult to systematise within a typical lexicographical framework.

In conclusion therefore, as already effectively demonstrated in Schneider and Uhlig's index, dictionaries should provide as the basic meaning of the verb ἐπιτάσσω, solely within a grammatical context, with explicit reference to the works of Apollonius Dyscolus, those of "to affix", "to juxtapose". Additionally, the differing meanings that arise in various contexts and examples need to be specified, i.e. not only therefore the meaning of "to place after", which occurs at times as the dictionaries under analysis show, but also the meaning of "to place before"⁶⁸. The entry for the adjective ἐπιταγματικός should instead include not only the basic meaning of the term ("subsidiary"), but also the interpretation, one may say ideological, with which Apollonius sometimes uses this appellative – and, as we have seen, also the term ἐπίρρημα – in the sense of "placed before"⁶⁹.

Such additions and changes would, on one hand, capture the complex semantic features of the vocabulary and, on the other, identify precisely the single meanings that these words may have, thereby allowing us to understand more profoundly, by untying certain lexical knots, important aspects of Apollonius' doctrine.

67 Illuminating in this sense is the term δίδθεις which over time has acquired a precise technical meaning: in metalinguistic terminology in fact it indicates the value taken by the verb as regards the type of relation that is created between the subject and the action itself. However, in the works of Apollonius Dyscolus this noun has still a generic meaning that allows it to be used in contexts, albeit always relating to the description of the characteristics of the verb in the Greek language, that differ greatly one from the other. For an essential bibliography on this subject, see Lambert 1978, Julien 1985, Pantiglioni 1998 and Mársico 2006.

68 Consider in fact the passage previously examined: in particular see *Adv.* 125.9.

69 Schneider and Uhlig's index (Schneider/Uhlig 1878-1910, III) offers for ἐπιταγματικός also the translation *postpositivus* for just one passage: *Pron.* 116.5. However, in the light of the textual interventions mentioned, also in this passage the Greek adjective possesses a meaning assimilable to those proposed here; see *supra*.

The Making of Greek Scholiastic *Corpora*

Fausto Montana

«... ce n'est pas nécessairement l'apparition d'un
nouvel instrument qui crée un nouveau besoin;
plus souvent, à l'inverse, c'est le besoin qui crée
l'instrument propre à le satisfaire.»

P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris
1971, 109

1. Setting the question

1.1. What is a *corpus* of scholia?

Let us clear the field of terminological ambiguities. It has been clarified that in antiquity the term σχόλιον, the diminutive of σχολή, that is to say “short reading”, “brief explanation”, “notes”, implied no reference to the position of the note itself with respect to the text commented upon¹. One finds it used in Cicero's letters (*ad Att.* 16, 7, 3) to indicate a philosophical lecture on a moral subject. Later, between the imperial age and the early Byzantine age, the plural σχόλια designated reports on lectures or comments by a teacher of repute, disposed in concise comic form. They consisted of sequences of annotations, which were gathered together in a book separate from the work to which the comment refers (as in formal terms was the case for the ancient Alexandrian or late antique philosophical *hypomnemata*²), although at times they could

English translation by Rachel Barritt Costa.

1 E.g. Erbse 1965, 2723; Lundon 1997.

2 Zuntz 1975, 64-73 (who sees the term scholia as embodying an implicit opposition to the more complex and erudite character of the *hypomnemata*); cf. Luzzatto 1993b, 111 with n. 3; Lundon 1997; Dickey 2007, 11 n. 25. Many examples of σχόλια (i.e. “comments”) dating from Vth-VIIth c. are cited by Richard 1950, especially 194-197; cf. Leanza 1995, 209-214, for “comments by scholia” («commenti a scoli») in the framework of biblical exegesis. Lamberz

also be found transcribed at the side or in the margin of the work³. At any rate, therefore, the reciprocal position of notes and related source text did not constitute a distinctive and characteristic feature of these scholia.

In modern philology on classical authors, however, the term σχόλιον / *scholium* has undergone a semantic specialization, chiefly under the influence of the great anonymous *corpora* of explanatory annotations (just σχόλια) usually running alongside the ancient works of poetry or prose in many medieval manuscripts dating from IXth c. onwards. Thus today the word is generally taken to mean *tout court* a textual explanation placed in the margin with respect to the concerned main text: any marginal note considered in its own right, that is to say, disregarding to other contextual characteristics, is usually denominated *scholium*⁴.

Nevertheless, if on the contrary we evaluate a marginal explanation of this last mentioned type *without* disregarding its context, but with due consideration for the exegetic system or approach to which it belongs, then we are constrained to introduce some more specific observations and distinctions. The question arises of whether any series of marginal annotations constitutes a “*corpus* of scholia” (i.e. a congeries in its way homogeneous, if not consistent), and whether it is possible to isolate a specific *quid* of the *corpora* devoted to the Greek authors of profane literature as we know them by manuscripts starting from the mid Byzantine age. One may also wonder whether the introduction of this *quid* can be projected backwards in time, and whether, therefore, the sources utilized to assemble the *corpora* that have come down to us were themselves scholiastic *corpora* (or *corpuscula*). These are non trivial queries, in the light of the historical significance and the cultural consequences of selecting and passing on to later generations the ancient interpretative

1987, especially 2–6, argues that in the field of neoplatonic exegesis the words *hypomnema* and *scholia* designated respectively the written work of a commentator and the reports of (oral) readings of a teacher.

3 This is the case, for instance, of the biblical comments of Hesychius of Jerusalem (Vth c.), in the opinion of Leanza 1995, 219–222, or of the marginal comment by Eutocius of Ascalon (roughly 500 A.D.) on the *Conics* of Apollonius of Perga, as well as the annotations jotted down by Maximus the Confessor and Anastasius of Sinai (VIth c.) in the margins of some of their own works: see Montana 2010.

4 E.g. Zuntz 1975, 79; cf. Luppe 2002, 55–57. For an useful – though ultimately aporetic – overview of more or less recent definitions and a discussion on «Kommentartypen» (word for word separate commentaries, scholia, summaries) see Ihm 2002, 2–10.

heritage that had accumulated over the centuries in connection with the works of the classical authors.

Faced with these uncertainties, we are induced to establish unequivocal terminology, that will make it possible to avert misunderstandings and, hopefully, to denominate different forms and phenomena with different names. Thus, just as we have defined the meaning(s) of *scholium*, we must likewise take a position with regard to the expression “*corpus of scholia*” when referring to mid Byzantine tradition of classical authors⁵.

We will define a *corpus* of scholia as an exegetic *editio variorum*, designed to be made up in an orderly way alongside or around the text commented upon⁶. By “*editio variorum*” we refer to the result of a carefully planned and systematic editorial process of compiling and stratifying different sources⁷. With the phrase “designed to be made up in an orderly way” we describe a fully deliberate codicological and paleographic set-up: first, the planning of the *mise en page* by the craftsman of the manuscript, that is to say, assigning the space required for the main text and the secondary text by ruling; secondly, the professional copyist’s well ordered execution of his task, which involved the carefully concerted *mise en texte* both of the main work and the associated annotations⁸. One can bear in mind as an example the layout of ms. Venezia,

-
- 5 Luppe 2002, 57, is of the view that the exegetic *marginalia* attested in literary papyri of late antiquity and the proto-Byzantine age are to be distinguished from the *corpora* of scholia conserved in medieval manuscripts by the fact that one can speak of “scholia”, but not of “scholiasts”, when referring to the *marginalia* (this statement takes up again the conclusion put forward by Zuntz 1975, 133). The complaints by Maniaci 2002, 3–4 n. 1, on the modern terminological deficiencies and incoherences regarding the *marginalia* of the papyri can be fully endorsed. Cf. Montana 2005, 4–5 n. 20.
 - 6 Cf. Dickey 2007, 12: medieval scholia «are dense and *systematic collections of extracts from different sources*» (my emphasis). These are characteristics that we begin to recognize, combined together, starting from IXth–Xth c. manuscripts, such as some of those belonged to Arethas, on which see Lemerle 1971, 210–237; Wilson 1983a, 120–130.
 - 7 The process of compilation is still recognizable, for instance, in ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2771 (Hesiod’s *Works and Days*), dating from the end of the Xth c., in the margins of which extracts of the commentary attributed to Proclus are mixed with materials from another exegetic work: Pertusi 1951, 151–155; 1955, IX; cf. West 1978, 68–69; Faraggiana 1978 and 1981.
 - 8 In the words of Maniaci 2002, 5–7, a “planned comment” («commento organizzato», designed «sin dalla progettazione del volume a coesistere con il suo testo di riferimento») is something different from the “anarchic” *marginalia* («inseriti senza un ordine particolare su pagine non originariamente predisposte a

Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 822, olim 454, of the Xth c., the renowned *Venetus A* of the *Iliad*⁹.

This definition is empirical and has a purely descriptive and practical aim as working hypothesis. Consequently it can be perfected and it can be expected to reveal defects and raise a number of problems. For instance, how should one evaluate manuscripts which hand down *corpora* of annotations arising within the same tradition of some marginal scholia but arranged in full page display in the form of a separate commentary (recensions à *recueil*), i.e. without the poetic text¹⁰ or distant from it¹¹?

questo scopo»). Equivalent concepts can be found in Holtz 1984 for the adventitious *marginalia*, especially 144 («il est primordial de pouvoir décider si ces éléments [textuels secondaires] sont entrés dans le livre avant le moment où il a quitté l'atelier de fabrication, ou après») and 146 («Quel que soit le nom qu'on leur donne, gloses, scholies, *marginalia*, l'essentiel est de prendre conscience d'une évidence, à savoir que l'introduction de ces éléments dans le manuscrit échappe au contrôle de celui qui l'a fabriqué»); see also 154-167, for the organized comment set in the margin of the text, or "commentated edition", the birth of which in the Latin sphere could be placed in VIIIth-IXth c. Ireland. Recent systematic quantitative studies on the codicological peculiarities of medieval manuscripts with scholia, and on their paleographic and philological implications, include Maniaci 2000, 2006a, and 2006b.

9 On this manuscript see now Dué 2009.

10 The type of "scholia alone" manuscript has a notorious example in the most ancient codices of the scholia D to the *Iliad*: ms. Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, gr. 6 + Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 4626 = 71 Iriarte, of the IXth c.; as well as the three mss. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 2193 (XIth c.), 33 (XIth c.) and 32 (XIIth c.): see Montanari 1979 (on the Romanus+Matritensis); Thiel 2000. The same happens with the scholia D to the *Odyssey* in their main and oldest ms., Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. V.I.51, of the Xth c.: Ernst 2006, VIII.

11 *Recueils* separate from the poetic text can be found, for example, in manuscripts of family *h* of the *Iliad* scholia (Erbse 1960, 188: «Scholienkonglomerate» in full page display alternate with lines from the poem in ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2766, of the XIVth c.), among which above all witnesses belonging to the traditional branch *h*₂ flourished in XIIIth c. Terra d'Otranto (Sciarra 2005, 13-74: *recueils* of scholia in full page display follow each book of the *Iliad* in mss. Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 116 sup.; Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 122, up to book 12 of the poem; Cologny, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Bodmer 85; Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat gr. 1316; the scholia are arranged all together after the text of the poem in ms. Oxford, New College, 298; only scholia to books 1-12 of the *Iliad*, without the text of the poem, can be read in ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2556, foll. 34r-78v). In all these cases «sembra che l'interesse primario non fosse la lettura contestuale di testo e scoli, quanto l'accumulazione di questo e quelli in un unico tomo, accanto a operette esegetiche, allegoriche e grammati-

Are they eccentric solutions in comparison with the “norm”? In some cases we can document that here we are dealing with the editorial outcome of a path that proceeds backwards: starting from one or more *corpora* of marginal scholia, it derives and (re)composes a separate full page comment formally similar in effect to continuous *hypomnemata*¹². Moreover, it is not unusual to find materials re-worked in the opposite direction, i.e. cases of re-montage from the full page to the margins¹³. Such examples provide additional arguments – if any are needed – in favour

cali, con l'intento evidente di fruirne in maniera indipendente dal testo cui facevano riferimento» (Sciarra 2005, 236).

- 12 A few examples, among the many possible. Ms. Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 762, olim 464, an autograph of Demetrius Triclinius dated 1316–1319, after the text of the Hesiodic *Theogony* (accompanied by explanations called ἐκλογή ἀπὸ τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίων κτλ.: foll. 145r–169r), gives the *recueil* entitled εἰς τὴν Ἡσιόδου Θεογονίαν σχόλια τινὰ μερικά, παλαιά (foll. 170r–184v): Di Gregorio 1974, 12–14; 1975, IX–X. Andronicus Callistus composed a recension à *recueil* of metrical scholia to tragedies of Sophocles (ms. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.Q.5.20 = gr. 87 Puntoni, from the mid XVth c.: Turyn 1952, 81–82; Tessier 2005, XXIV–XXVII), «redatta con tutta verosimiglianza in occasione dell'insegnamento nell'Ateneo bolognese» between 1458 and 1466 (Tessier 2005, XXV, with previous bibliography), and also a recension of exegetic and metrical scholia to plays of Euripides and Aristophanes (ms. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.U.9.22 = gr. 93 Puntoni, autograph: Zuretti 1892, 16–17; Turyn 1957, 202–204; Smith 1975, 82–84; Eberline 1980, 46–47; cf. Tessier 2005, XXXVI n. 48); these scholiographic *recueils* were transcribed by Michael Souliardos between the XVth and XVIth c. in ms. Cambridge, University Library, Dd.11.70 (Turyn 1952, 82; 1957, 204–205; Smith 1975, 84–85 n. 65; Eberline 1980, 46; Tessier 2005, XXVII–XXVIII). Ms. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, α.T.9.4 = gr. 41 Puntoni, also from the XVth c., contains the *vetera* to the entire tragic heptad of Sophocles, without the literary text, and these are followed, in another hand, by the scholia of Thomas Magister to *Ajax*, *Electra* and *Cedipus rex* 1–1111 (Turyn 1952, 104 and 68; Christodoulos 1977, 39*). It is also worth recalling the rich lineage of Renaissance manuscripts (XVth–XVIth c.) with only scholia to the tragedies of Aeschylus (Smyth 1933, 34), among which above all apographs of ms. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 32.9 (Turyn 1943, 20–26) and of exemplars of the “Class π” witnesses of the triad *Prometheus Bound*, *Seven against Thebes* and *Persians* (Turyn 1943, 29 and 48ff.).
- 13 The *mise en texte* of the ms. of Otrantine provenance, Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, phil. gr. 49 (third quarter of the XIIIth c.), a witness of the *Iliad* with marginal scholia, shows that «il modello, che doveva avere dinanzi a sé il copista, presentava gli scolii non nei margini, bensì alla fine di ciascun libro: per evitare di commettere errori e per eseguire la copia il più rapidamente possibile, il copista deve aver lavorato ‘a catena di montaggio’» (Sciarra 2005, 52), i.e. transcribing first of all the scholia in the reserved sections in the margins, and then the text of the poem at the center of the page.

of investigating into the reasons and criteria underlying the individual solutions and their relations with the (here presumed) traditional component that displays the text and the scholia together on the same page.

Even granted the perfectibility of the definition, however we have to acknowledge and emphasize its usefulness. Focusing on the editorial criteria utilized in compiling the materials as a constitutive factor of scholiastic *corpora* has a number of consequences on the plane of text criticism. Viewed from this perspective, the manuscripts that transmit scholia are, as far as the scholiastic component is concerned, *copies* of a rather unusual kind due to the specific “open” nature of erudite works. Each copy is potentially the medium of original contributions, not only as regards textual criticism (for example, by endorsing a given variant in the main text) but also with regard to genuine redactional aspects that may have affected the overall structure or single parts of the *corpus* (abridgment, expansion, contamination), to a degree mainly unknown to the tradition of literary texts. It follows that the ecdotics of scholiastic *corpora* requires a special approach: the *recensio* aimed at reconstructing the family tree of a tradition should ensure full respect for the individuality of each of the manufactures, as each of them may represent in fact not merely an apograph but the one and only witness of a text-editing project ultimately satisfying some actual needs or a subjective intention¹⁴.

1.2. The “beginnings” of scholiography

If a scholiastic *corpus* is something as defined above, then the enquiry into the origin of scholiography cannot be addressed in rather general terms, but must instead be treated from two different perspectives. From the *typological* point of view, this implies seeking to ascertain the nature of the technique we designate as scholiastic, and enquiring into when, where and through what kind of contexts and forms it arose in Graeco-Roman culture. From the point of view of the *textual tradition*, it implies starting out from the ancient and medieval witnesses of a *corpus* in order to reconstruct the process that resulted in its formation, and to fix the moment or moments that marked the stage of selection or agglutination from different sources and the ordered arrangement of the exegetic amalgam, as an hypertext, in the margin of the work commented upon.

It is plain that the question of the origin of scholiography is no mere stemmatic problem, but rather has notable historical-cultural relevance. The process of formation of the collections embodies selective *transfer* of

14 On the shifting concept of “original” and the ensuing consequences for textual criticism: Chiesa 2002, 137–146.

a multifaceted array of ancient erudite materials (*hypomnemata*, *syngrammata*, *lexeis* and so on) from independent media and formats (*volumina* and *codices*) into the margins of the editions of literary texts (*codices*); therefore, it implies constant re-working of the contents of this marginal apparatus, from one manuscript exemplar to another, by means of cuts and additions that sprang from the concrete requirements of readers, users, and purchasers of the books. In this process the most significant moment – the typological gap that distinguishes a copy with exegetic *marginalia* from one supplied with a *corpus* of scholia – takes place when the editorial and codicological action becomes culturally complex, namely when it shifts to a programmatic approach of systematic compilation in pursuit of ends that are not episodic and contingent, but rather have the goal of long-term selection, conservation and safeguarding of the exegetic heritage. Therefore the node of the question can be seen in the following terms: when and where, within the diachronic axis and the geographic grid of Graeco-Roman and Byzantine culture, there first arose the subjects and the significant episodes of this mutation in literary text exegesis, which signalled the genuine birth of scholiography.

1.3. Boundaries (and limits) of the evidence

The risk of generalization, which affects the very enquiry into the origin of scholiography, has to be averted on other levels of investigation as well.

Firstly, the geographically and culturally sectorial character of the papyrus finds (Graeco-Roman Egypt, with a strong prevalence of Oxyrhynchus) should warn against the temptation to simplify the perspective, as this could lead to the mistaken attitude defined by Irigoin as «égyptocentrisme»¹⁵. Even taking into account the documented relation in the imperial age between Oxyrhynchus and an area of absolute cultural primacy such as that of Alexandria¹⁶, and even granting that the Oxyrhynchus framework is at least relatively representative¹⁷, we have no certainties on the actual coverage of the preserved pattern with respect to the wide range of cultural configurations that arose over the course of time within and outside of Egypt¹⁸, in the composite patch-

15 Irigoin 1994, 136 (discussion with H. Maehler).

16 Krüger 1990.

17 Papathomas 2003, 284–285; McNamee 2007, 11.

18 E.g. Wilson 1967, 248–249; cf. Cavallo 1995a, 205–206; McNamee 2007, 5–11.

work of the metropolitan schools and institutions of the Eastern Empire¹⁹.

The lacunose nature of this picture and the fact that the documentation is heavily tipped in favour of the Egyptian area exert a negative influence in a further respect. We run the risk of masking the possible independent polygenesis of experiences linked to the constitution of *corpora* of scholia to classical authors built up by different subjects, distant from one another – both as cultural entities and individual personalities – and of thus encouraging the idea that this history underwent an indisputably progressive and linear evolution. This leads to the illusion of being able to reconstruct highly complex historical phenomena by proceeding on the basis of genetic and deterministic simplifications²⁰.

In addition, the documentation that has come down to us is sectorial in relation to genre of the texts and ways of their reception. In fact, the characters and the very conditions of the extant documentation demonstrate that, over time and as contexts changed, different intentions in the use of the ancient literary heritage exerted different effects on the conservation and transmission of the works and the associated exegesis. In other words, the extent and form of what has come down to us should be interpreted as the outcome of some specific reasons within the restricted context of its utilization; and it obviously does not reflect (nor, much less, does it coincide with) the complexity of the entire tradition, the overwhelming part of which is lost. Today we can assert with a fair degree of certainty that in Egypt during the imperial age the transmission of Greek literary texts proper (poetry and, in the framework of prose, above all oratory and historiography) was heavily influenced by

19 On cultural life in Athens, Alexandria, Antioch, Gaza, Beirut, Constantinople between late antiquity and the first Byzantine age: Wilson 1983a, 28-60; Cavallo 1986.

20 Cavallo 1986, 99. Overall, I share the methodological reservations expressed by Maniaci 2002, 11 with n. 1, concerning the “genetic” interpretations of the birth of scholiography that claim to «ordinare cronologicamente in sequenza lineare l’apparizione delle diverse forme, ipotizzando la derivazione dell’una dalle altre»: there are too many gaps in the book-making documentation that has come down to us from late antiquity, and our knowledge of the attendant cultural and material circumstances is too meagre, to allow the statement that phenomena of this kind arose at a single time and in only one place for all types (what Zetzel 1975 defines as the «single pattern of development»). Therefore it is right to call for greater attention to «archaeological observation of the manuscripts» (p. 10). I feel, however, that one should also guard against excessive scepticism about the possibility of composing the extant documentation into historically reliable frameworks by starting out from significant cases.

the developments and transformations affecting the cultural subjects that were most closely concerned with these fields, namely school and scholarship. Educational *curricula* and critical trends acted as powerful factors of text selection and transmission. It cannot be doubted that these factors, together with the mere chance of the finds, coalesced to produce some absences in the known tradition, above all for late antiquity²¹.

To this should be added the fact that differences in the utilization of poetry versus prose can be reconstructed for educational *curricula* in Graeco-Roman Egypt. There was a trend towards a canon of authors delineated by use and tradition in the school, constituting what Raffaella Cribiore has defined as the «minimal cultural package» of the second-level *curriculum*, managed by the *grammatikos*²². It consisted in reading for purposes of grasping the literal meaning and in composing a predominantly linguistic commentary on texts of poetry, among which works of Homer, Alcaeus, Pindar, Euripides, Aristophanes, Menander and Callimachus held a prominent position²³. This is the educational level associated with the majority of the Egyptian papyri containing texts of these authors with explanatory *marginalia*. The exegesis that has come down to us on literary prose (orators and historians) displays special features of its own, which were dictated not only by the intrinsic peculiarities of prose texts as compared to verse, but also by the different cultural demand that

21 It is known that the statistics on the documentation regarding literary book production of Graeco-Egyptian provenance – in which there is a massive preponderance of Oxyrhynchus finds – shows an ascending curve that begins to rise at around the time of the Ist c. A.D., increases sharply in the IInd c. (to which over 1700 finds, roughly one-third of the total, can be dated), and thereafter gradually decreases from the following century onwards. The curve that represents the chronological distribution of papyri with marginal annotations (closer to 5% than 10% of the total of literary papyri) is not dissimilar from this profile, except for the proportionally even greater divergence between finds from the IInd c. and those from other periods, and a greater quantity of finds from the Vth as compared to the IVth. Updated survey by McNamee 2007, 5–12; a rough assessment by Papathomas 2003, 255–269.

22 Cribiore 2001, 178–180; cf. McNamee 2007, 55–62.

23 McNamee 2007, 63–77. With regard to the presence of lyric poets as Alcaeus, Anacreon, Archilochus, and Bacchylides in the school *curriculum* see the important distinctions by Porro 2009, especially her conclusion, p. 202: the exegesis on these lyric poets so far attested in the papyri «is for the most part the fruit of the labour of philologists and scholars ... it is very likely that the surviving materials were also used, in part, at schools ... Nevertheless, schools are certainly not the principal reference point for the majority of the preserved exegetical material».

prevailed in the imperial age, when interest in these texts was prompted above all by requirements springing from the field of rhetoric²⁴.

A rather different destiny was apparently encountered by the extant exegetic texts pertaining to works of a paraliterary nature and endowed with technical content, which pertained to more strongly professionalized or specialist branches of knowledge: science, medicine, law, philosophy, the *Scriptures*. Here, in late antiquity the form of the commentary took on the character of the standard mode of theoretical, critical and also self-referential reflection by subjects who were personally involved in the respective professions (suffice it to cite the extensive Alexandrian exegetic production in the scientific and philosophical fields between the Vth and VIIth c.)²⁵. The pragmatic and authoritative status

24 On Alexandrian philology pertaining to prose writers: Pfeiffer 1968, 225; Nicolai 1992, 265-275; Irigoien 1994, 50, 54, 88 (discussion with D. M. Schenkeveld); Maehler 1994, 121-124; Montanari 1994, 132-133 (discussion with H. Maehler). On the predominance, during the imperial age, of interest in stylistic and rhetorical issues within the exegesis on historical writers: Luschnat 1954, 49; Criboire 2001, 144; McNamee 2007, 58-59, 117-125; see also Montana 2009b. An emblematic illustration of the attitude prevailing in late antiquity is given by the opening part of the *Life of Thucydides* attributed to Marcellinus, which testifies to the natural and direct connection of the Thucydidean style of public speaking with Demosthenic oratory in the framework of rhetorical education (cf. Piccirilli 1985, 62-63, *ad l.*). A "grammatical" utilisation of prose works, for purposes of schooling, is testified by the *marginalia* on papyrus and by the scholia: McNamee 2007, 58-59, suggests that reading the prose writers was a typical requirement at all levels of education and training, and that the third level involved grammatical teaching on the texts of these authors in addition to training in rhetoric.

25 Selectively: Wilson 1983a, 42-49; Donini 1994; Romano 1994; Manetti 1998; the papers collected by Most 1999; Sluiter 2000b; Dickey 2007, 10; Majcherek 2008. Sluiter 1999 looks typologically into the common didactic aims of ancient commentaries and stresses the self-mirroring of the commentators and their teaching in source texts; from a historical point of view, we know that commentaries met a variety of educational needs and cultural demands at different degrees and contexts, and we can observe with Manetti 1998, 1205, that «Un intento didattico è quasi sempre iscritto nella stesura di un commentario, ma ciò non vuol dire che la sua destinazione sia sempre la scuola». On the peculiarities of medical commentaries see Ihm 2002, especially the *Einleitung*, and e.g., for Hippocrates: Andorlini 2000, 44; 2003, 11-13; Dickey 2007, 45; Stroppa 2009, 309-310; for Galen: Manetti 1998, 1209-1213; Vallance 1999. In the field of philosophy overviews of methods and cultural background of the posthellenistic Aristotelian commentators, for instance, are provided by Sorabji 1990, Baltussen 2008, and Golitsis 2008; on the speculative exegesis of Alexander of Aphrodisia see also Rashed 1995 and 2009, and Abbamonte 2004; Sorabji 2004, 1 synthesizes: «He [*scil.* Alexander of Aphrodisia], like

of texts used in professional fields embodying a high degree of specialized terminology and concepts seems to be at the origin of the continuity of demand and consequent tradition, and it led to more substantial conservation of forms and contents of the associated exegetic and unceasingly speculative apparatus. The latter predominantly maintained the form of a separate commentary (no longer in *volumina*, but in codices) without interruption from late antiquity to the advanced Middle Ages, via Syriac and Arabic translations from the VIIth c. onwards (at least for science and philosophy)²⁶. This continuity offers an eloquent testimony of the way the genre or the cultural context to which a work belonged could exert a positive or negative influence on its reception, its form and the preservation of the associated exegetic tradition²⁷.

2. The beginnings of scholiography: survey and debate

2.1. Survey

The question has reached a high degree of complexity because of the increase in documentation through finds and study of the papyri, as well as from progress achieved in the fields of related disciplines (history of the textual tradition, paleography, codicology, history of the book and of libraries, cultural history in general). We can see a starting point of the discussion when John Williams White, in 1914, argued that the tradition of the comedies of Aristophanes and the related scholia must have dated back to a lost archetype from late antiquity, with the contents of ancient *hypomnemata* transported and amalgamated in its margins²⁸. Towards the end of the 1930s, Günther Zuntz radically revised

most of the others [*scil.* commentators], did much of his own Philosophy through the medium of Commentary on earlier Philosophy, and that is why the Greek philosophers of this period can be called commentators»; on Proclus and neoplatonic exegesis, Pépin/Saffrey 1987; on philosophical training in late antique Athens and Alexandria faced with growing christian education, theology and power, Lamberton 2001; Watts 2006.

26 E.g. Lemerle 1971, 23–24, 27–30. For the philosophical tradition: Canfora 1995, 208–213; on the role of the Arabic tradition: Serra 1995.

27 In other words, demand and reception incisively operated in different ways according to different genres and contexts, in spite both of the intentions and of the (alleged) singleness of philological and specialized-professional approach of the «intellectual network» (Sluiter 2000b, 186 and 190) consisting of ancient commentators of every field.

28 White 1914, LXIV–LXV; cf. Boudreaux 1919, 186–188.

this interpretation²⁹. He argued that the scholiasts' formal model was represented by the biblical *catenae*, a form of exegesis which arose in the VIth c. as separate systematic commentaries to books of the *Bible* and was later arranged in the shape of marginal comment; additionally, Zuntz maintained that only the minuscule handwriting which developed in the IXth c. could accommodate the characteristics displayed in scholiastic annotations, namely a high density compatible with compilation from different commentaries³⁰. According to this view, the scholiasts built up their marginal apparatuses by drawing on late commentaries contained in codices and separate from the literary text – outwardly descendants of the ancient *hypomnemata*. Although the paleographic argument has proven to be neither exact nor decisive³¹, Zuntz's approach prompted a new awareness of the need for more in-depth comparison between the scholia and the earlier exegetic tradition, thus sparking intense research into the alleged formation of *corpora* of scholia and birth of the scholiastic technique during late antiquity.

The main and leading student of this phase of research is Nigel G. Wilson³². He did not reject the possibility that ancient exegetic writings may in some cases have been handed down “intact” to the Byzantine scholiasts – albeit in manipulated and multiple drafts put together in late antiquity – and might then have been used selectively by these scholiasts as a source for their marginal annotations, while still continuing to enjoy a life of their own in the direct tradition. Such was the destiny of Heraclitus' ‘Ὅμηρικὰ προβλήματα and of the first book of Porphyry's ‘Ὅμηρικὰ ζητήματα, which we possess as independent works as well as excerpts disseminated throughout the Homeric scholia³³. Nevertheless, Wilson pointed to the generalized diffusion of the codex at the expense of the scroll during late antiquity as the fundamental historical circumstance that led to the birth of scholiography³⁴ and hypothesized a

29 Zuntz 1975; cf. 1965, 273–275.

30 An argument already put forward by Allen 1931, 187 (cf. Wilson 1984, 106–107).

31 See the *Nachwort* in Zuntz 1975, on POxy. XX 2258; and *infra*, 2.2.4.

32 Above all Wilson 1967; overview in Wilson 1983a, 33–36; 1983b, 90–93 (2007, 46–50); 2004, 129–130.

33 Heraclitus: Pontani 2005a; Russell/Konstan 2005. Porphyry: Sodano 1970. A similar case is the commentary of Olympiodorus to Plato's *Alcibiades I*, extracts of which are also preserved in the scholia to Plato: Antonio Carlini *apud* Wilson 1983b, 93 n. 16 (2007, 50 n. 24).

34 An invitation not to overestimate this aspect, in the light of the “commented editions” on scroll (see *infra*, 2.2.3), comes from Messeri Savorelli/Pintaudi 2002, 54–55.

“mixed” origin of the *corpora* of scholia: «The ninth-century scholars probably used one or two *hypomnemata* in separate books and some others preserved as marginal commentary»; and, thanks to the introduction of minuscule script, «the process of conflating and enlarging the scholia, which I assume to have begun in late antiquity, continued with increasing vigour in the ninth century»³⁵. While admitting that individual *corpora* may actually not have arisen until the IXth c., as in the case of Homeric scholia³⁶, Wilson put forward several arguments designed to demonstrate a late antique season of scholiography. These arguments can be summarized in the following four points: (1) the possible existence of marginal biblical *catenae* as early as the VIth c.; (2) the use of the adverb *aliter* – a mark of compilation of different exegetic sources and corresponding to ἄλλως in the later Byzantine scholia – in Latin exegetic and scholiastic writings datable to late antiquity; (3) the existence, attested by the papyri, of large-sized late antique codices alleged to have a substantial marginal exegetic apparatus which could be the fruit of compilation; (4) the documented availability of tiny-sized forms of majuscule Greek writings during late antiquity, which are potentially consistent with the making of dense marginal annotation (against Zuntz’s paleographic argument)³⁷. Further contributions on the paleographic aspects of the question have been offered by Guglielmo Cavallo, who agrees with the possibility of rich marginal annotations in majuscule script, and supposes the late antique origin of some subscriptions which document the sources of the scholiasts in some medieval manuscripts³⁸.

Following in Wilson’s footsteps, over the last thirty years Kathleen McNamee has provided new contributions shedding light on many details that make up the mosaic of literary exegesis between the imperial Roman age and the Byzantine age. McNamee focuses above all on the characteristics of some “large-” or “new-format” codices from late antiquity containing Greek literary texts with exegetic *marginalia*, and on the search for evidence of a compilatory practice adopted by the annotators of these copies (in continuity with one of Wilson’s arguments). Her most original contribution resides in establishing a connection between these books and coeval Latin juridical codices from Egypt with rich *marginalia* in Greek and Latin, ascribable to Graeco-oriental environ-

35 Wilson 1967, 247.

36 *Ibidem*; cf. Erbse 1971, 547.

37 The general view and the individual arguments championed by Wilson have been widely and authoritatively welcomed: e.g. Irigoin 1984, 97; 1994, 77-79 (and, even before, 1952, 97-99, on Pindar).

38 Cavallo 1992, 98-104. See *infra*, 2.2.4.

ments and ultimately traceable to an important school of law, such as that of Beirut. The chronological contiguity and the common oriental context could point to these legal codices as the model both of the biblical *catenae* and also of the densely annotated Greek literary manuscripts, held to be precursors of the later *corpora* of scholia³⁹.

In contrast, Herwig Maehler embraces the opposite perspective, supporting the core elements of Zuntz's position. On several occasions, he has placed emphasis on the documentation which suggests that commentaries on codices separate from the text commented upon did indeed persist well into late antiquity and the early Byzantine age. Such documentation, Maehler believes, may constitute evidence that the earlier exegetic heritage came down to philologists of the mid Byzantine age in precisely this form⁴⁰.

2.2. Debate

For the sake of clarity, we will devote separate attention to each of the arguments that have emerged from the ongoing debate. But since this is merely an expository device, it should by no means obscure the contiguity and reciprocal connections among the different points of the question. One aspect that links all of them and which it may be helpful to emphasize as a preliminary step is the following: bearing in mind the basic underlying question (did manuscripts with scholiastic *corpora*, as attested starting from the IXth-Xth c., already exist beforehand?), what particularly concerns us is to ascertain whether the simultaneous presence of at least two essential characteristics of scholiography, namely *density* of annotation and *compilation* from several different sources performed by the annotator, did indeed feature in the witnesses of exegetic *marginalia* dating from late antiquity and the early Byzantine age.

2.2.1. Biblical *catenae*

In the early decades of the VIth c., study of the *Scriptures* led to development of the technique of the *catenae*, in Greek σείραί, possibly an innovation, attributed to Procopius of Gaza, which consisted in collecting *excerpta* for exegetic purposes taken from different authors and concerning the same passage from the *Bible*⁴¹. The extant manuscripts, dating from two or more centuries later, testify to *catenae* both in the form

39 McNamee 1995; 1998; 2007, 79-93 (especially 82).

40 Maehler 1994; 1998; 2000; cf. Stroppa 2009.

41 Devreesse 1928; Geerard 1980, 185-259; Dorival 1986.

of a commentary separate from the scriptural text (*Breitkatenen*), and also as a marginal commentary (*Randkatenen*). The problem is that of establishing when the second type developed: this is a significant question as it clearly can affect the relation between *catenae* and scholia and it intersects with the enquiry into the origin of scholiography to profane texts.

Procopius, in introducing his own *catena* on the *Octateuchos*, makes reference to two distinct editions of the work: the first, defined as σύγγραμμα, had grown to elephantine proportions, so that he decided to «make a compendium of the work and scale it down to a manageable size»⁴². While it is evident that the *maior* edition constituted a work separate from the text forming the object of the commentary, it is far from clear – indeed, it is disputed – whether the *minor* was a marginal *catena*⁴³. The most ancient known evidence of the marginal type is said to date from around the beginning of the VIIIth c. and is represented by the *Codex Zacynthius* of the *New Testament*, with the biblical text and the *catena* in majuscule⁴⁴, and by the information concerning the *catena* of

42 *Prooem.* (PG 87, 21): ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τὰς ῥήσεις αὐτὰς τῶν ἐκθεμένων αὐτολεξεῖ ἐξεθέμεθα, εἴτε σύμφωνοι πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἐτύγχανον, εἴτε καὶ μὴ, καὶ πρὸς πληθὺς ἄπειρον ἡμῖν ἐντεῦθεν τὸ σύγγραμμα παρετίνατο, συνείδον νῦν πρὸς μέτρον εὐσταλὲς συνελεῖν τὴν γραφὴν. Ἐπειγόμενος εἰ μὲν τι σύμφωνον ἅπασιν εἴρηται, τοῦτο προσάπαξ εἰπεῖν· εἰ δέ τι διάφορον, καὶ τοῦτο συντόμως ἐκθέσθαι πρὸς τὸ διὰ πάντων ἐν γενέσθαι σώμα τῆς γραφῆς, ὥς ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου τὰς ἀπάντων ἡμῖν ἐκθεμένου φωνάς. The text of Procopius' *catena* on *Genesis* and *Exodus*, drawn from ms. München, Bayerische Nationalbibliothek, gr. 358 (IXth c.), can be read also in Petit 1977.

43 This possibility, admitted by Wilson, is rejected by Petit 1977, XX, who notes that in his own epitome «Procopé a donc fusionné en un *commentaire continu* les diverses citations de sa chaîne de base, supprimant toutes les attributions et rédigeant des raccords» (my emphasis); cf. Petit 1986, XCVII n. 2: in Procopius' epitome «l'on trouve non pas des citations littérales et dotées d'attributions comme dans la tradition caténique, mais le texte des sources remanié en un *commentaire continu*». In IXth c., Phot., *Bibl.* 206 (164b 27–30 Henry) (Ἀνεγνώσθη Προκοπίου σοφιστοῦ ἐξηγητικαὶ σχολαὶ εἰς τε τὴν Ὀκτάτευχον τῶν παλαιῶν γραμμάτων καὶ εἰς τὰς Βασιλείας καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ Παραλειπόμενα) apparently refers to collections of comments edited in books separate from related biblical texts. I thank Professor Massimo Bernabò for having drawn my attention to this passage.

44 Lower script of the palimpsest Cambridge, University Library, British and Foreign Bible Society, 213: Gregory-Aland Ξ (No. 040) (cf. Zuntz 1975, Pl. III). The dating is controversial and the hypotheses range between the VIth (Hatch 1937) and the VIIIth/IXth c. (Zuntz 1975, 97 with n. 4; Wilson 1967, 253); Parker/Birdsall 2004 conclude in favour of a date around the year 700.

John Drungarios to the four *Major Prophets*⁴⁵. Zuntz argued that the placing of the comment in the margin of the biblical text was an innovation, introduced in a period later than Procopius⁴⁶, and that it then provided the inspiration for philologists and copyists who, from the IXth c. onwards, making use of minuscule script created the scholiastic compilations to profane authors⁴⁷. According to this reconstruction, the procedure of compiling from different sources lies upstream, that is to say, it has to do with the composition of the *catena* as a separate commentary, in a somewhat similar manner to the ancient *hypomnemata* to the classical authors, where different opinions were often recorded under the same lemma.

Wilson, on the other hand, has placed particular emphasis on the use of the adverb ἄλλως (in the sense of “otherwise”, “alternatively”, “or also”) to separate divergent interpretations of the same passage both in the *corpora* of scholia and also in the documented marginal *catenae*. Since ἄλλως is found with this function in Procopius’ *catena* on the *Canticle of Canticles* (PG 87, e.g. 1605c), Wilson surmises that this *catena* arose as a set of marginal annotations and that the abridged edition the author alludes to in the above cited premise to the *catena* on the *Octateuchos* was likewise of this type. If so, this would mean that the *catenae* almost immediately took on the form of marginal annotation. Wilson also conjectures that IVth and Vth c. Latin exegetic works may have introduced the

45 Zuntz 1975, 98; cf. Dorival 1984, 372–373 (who suggests a “two-columns” *catena*, one for the biblical text and one for the comment); Leanza 1995, 220–221. It should however be considered that the expression of John τῇδε τῇ βίβλῳ παραθέσθαι could indicate not so much “arrange in the margins” as, rather, “citing”, “copying out” exegetic extracts: on παρατίθεσθαι and similar compounds with παρα- see *infra*, 2.2.4. with n. 153. On the *catena* of John: Devreesse 1928, 1147; Geerard 1980, 216–221.

46 Zuntz 1975, 88–89 (who sees a direct relation between the invention of the *catena* in the form of a separate comment and the *Talmud*, an exegetic stratification that became consolidated in the Jewish tradition in the Vth c., defined by the German scholar as «die einzige Katenenhandschrift aus frühbyzantinischer Zeit, über die wir Sicheres wissen», together with the Justinian *Pandects*: 96 with n. 4). A similar conclusion is reached, albeit without putting forward any chronological proposals, by Devreesse 1928, 1092: «Nous pensons qu’il faut mettre au début de l’œuvre des scholiastes [*i.e.* of those who composed marginal *catenae*], tout à côté des chaînes à deux ou trois auteurs, les essais de chaînes autour d’un commentaire réputé».

47 Zuntz 1975, 107–110. More recent studies (Dorival 1986, 56ff., 94–96) show that there may have existed a type intermediate between the form of the *catena* separate from the biblical text and that of the marginal *catena*, namely a *catena* set alongside the scriptural text, both arranged on the same page in two columns; *contra* Leanza 1995, 222–227.

use of *aliter*, equivalent of ἄλλως, to distinguish different interpretations adduced to illustrate the same literary passage (we will return to this shortly): so he concludes that the scholia to profane authors arose earlier than the *catenae*, the latter having, in his view, arisen later as an imitation of such scholia. According to this sequence of hypotheses, the following pattern could be suggested, in this order: scholia to Greek authors from at least the Vth century, scholia to Latin authors towards the end of the century, and, finally, marginal biblical *catenae* from at least the early decades of the VIth c.⁴⁸. Backdating the origin of the marginal *catenae* and inverting the line of descent between profane scholia and *catenae* as reconstructed by Zuntz pushes the birth of scholiography back to the Vth c.⁴⁹.

Wilson contends that one of the pieces of evidence for the later origin of the *catenae* as compared to the scholia is that in the *catenae* the sources set in series are explicitly mentioned, whereas anonymous citations prevail in the scholia. Therefore the biblical exegetes' choice should, he believes, be seen as an innovation they introduced because they were particularly sensitive (or at least, more so than the scholiasts) to the importance of handing down the authorship of interpretations, whose orthodoxy could otherwise be called into question⁵⁰. This argument, which introduces an appropriate and interesting distinction, is however not cogent for the purpose of establishing a relative chronology. Indeed, starting out from the very same premises one can actually reach the opposite conclusion, namely that since the scholiasts were less interested in conserving the memory of the identity of the exegetic *authoritates*, or felt they were under less of a requirement to do so, they

48 Wilson 1967, 252-254; 1984, 108-109.

49 Wilson 1967, 254-256, goes so far as to individuate the possible πρώτος εὐρετής of Greek scholiography as Zosimus of Gaza (perhaps to be identified with Zosimus of Ascalon), the rhetor from the same city as Procopius and slightly older than him, who appears from the *Suda* (s.v. Ζώσιμος, ζ 169 Adler) to have written an exegetic work on Demosthenes and on Lysias. But it is somewhat questionable to disregard, at the very least, the fact – which is not devoid of consequences for the entire question – that in the *Suda* this exegetic composition is defined ὑπόμνημα (p. 255: «hypomnema is not strictly the word applicable to scholia as we know them, but this is scarcely an objection, since the writers of the *Suda* were not necessarily precise in such matters»: barring evidence to the contrary, the opposite is also true).

50 Wilson 2004, 130; 2007, 47-48. For a reverse opinion see Petit 1977, XVI: «Les caténistes [to *Genesis* and *Exodus* in the Sinaitic tradition] ont fait preuve, dans le choix de leurs sources, d'un éclectisme et d'une liberté d'esprit qui nous étonnent. Ils ont puisé à toutes les écoles, et n'ont pas hésité à accueillir des auteurs plus ou moins suspects d'hérésie, sans aucun souci de controverse».

adopted a less reverent and more economical criterion, which enabled them to save space, to the benefit of a further annotation. Exegesis of the Holy Book also had to take into account orthodoxy and the principles of faith dogmatically dictated by the ecclesiastical authority and held under the rigid control of the latter, often in the framework of bitter doctrinal controversies. The interpretation of literary texts, on the contrary, not only had to consider the horizon of expectations of its private and institutional addressees, but it also obeyed moral and formal categories that were not under the sway of a unitary rule-making authority, and which had a blander social and cultural impact. Furthermore, thinning out titles and names of authors for reasons of space or because of the specific destination of each individual copy, was a process characteristic of the tradition of profane erudite works, and it can be seen in action in *hypomnemata* on papyrus dating from the imperial age⁵¹. Thus there would be little cause for surprise if it were to turn out that the sources utilized by the medieval scholiasts had already to a great extent lost precise indication of the authorship of the reported interpretations.

A variant on Wilson's position has been proposed by Kathleen McNamee, who is inclined, as mentioned earlier, to see both the biblical *catenae* and the scholia to profane authors as originating from the exegetic technique adopted in Latin large-format legal codices of late antiquity with bilingual Greek and Latin *marginalia*⁵². We will return to this point later.

In short: Zuntz acknowledges the posteriority of the surviving scholiography to profane Greek literary texts (IXth/Xth centuries) as compared to the most ancient marginal *catenae* that have either come down to us or are attested indirectly (roughly 700 A.D.). Wilson and McNamee considerably backdate the procedure of scholiastic compilation, presuming (in the absence of direct evidence) the existence of marginal *catenae* from the VIth c. onwards and of Greek and Latin scholiography from the Vth onwards. That neither of the two hypotheses – the first relying closely on the surviving documentation, the second highly conjectural – is incontrovertible reflects the *impasse* in which, at the present state of knowledge, we run aground when assessing this aspect of the question.

51 Cf. e.g. Trojahn 2002, 198–199; Montana 2004, 372. According to Wilson 1984, 109, on the contrary, «it is to be assumed that when the compilers did their work the names of most of the authors of ancient monographs were still known».

52 McNamee 1995, 406; 2007, 82.

2.2.2. Latin scholia. *Aliter* / ἄλλως

Just as in the biblical *catenae*, so also in the scholia to profane Greek authors different interpretations concerning the same passage are often separated by ἄλλως. With respect to the problem of the origin of scholiography, the aim has been to set the use of this adverb within the history of the exegetic tradition, recognizing that it acts as a verbal alert signalling the application of the compilative procedure⁵³. It is reasonable to expect that the parallel field of Latin scholiography will shed some light on this question. It should however be pointed out straightaway that appending a meaning to the comparative assessment does not involve mechanically assigning an actual historical-traditional contiguity of any type between the two fields. Once again, the typological and the historical levels should be kept clearly distinct, and any temptation to draw abstract and unwarranted inferences concerning the historical facts by starting out from the typological aspect should be cautiously avoided.

In contrast to the Greek side of the problem, in the Latin field we are more fortunate with regard to the documentation that has survived, as we have famous late antique parchment codices with texts of Terence, Cicero, Vergil, Juvenal and Persius which constitute witnesses of marginal exegetic annotation that we have the opportunity to observe and examine over the length of entire works⁵⁴. Yet despite this, not even within the Latin sphere has research been able to achieve positive certainty with regard to the possible origin in late antiquity of the scholiastic compilations of which we have evidence in later manuscripts. Louis Holtz sets the origin of scholiography to the Latin classical authors in the framework of Irish erudite culture between the VIIIth and IXth c.

53 Dover 1993, 97, sees in the use of ἄλλως in the scholia to Aristophanes the proof that they must have had as immediate source «ancient scholia, not an ancient commentary», because it would be absurd to think that strikingly similar explanations were conflated into a single comment separate from the text. However, this argument can be dismissed if one supposes that the scholiasts' source was not *one single* commentary but more than one (as Zuntz believes). In the commentary of Theon to Pindar's *Pythian Odes* (POxy. XXXI 2536, IInd c. A.D.) one finds a detailed explanation (col. I 20–26), the meaning of which is repeated in the scholia, where, however, it is distinguished into two parts by means of ἄλλως: an example, in the opinion of Maehler 1994, 117, «dass auch Scholien, die in den Hss. mit ἄλλως angeschlossen werden, also aus verschiedenen Quellen zu stammen scheinen, aus demselben Kommentar stammen können».

54 McNamee 2007, 2 n. 2, 89 (Table 4). The reference repertory is Lowe 1934–1972. A recent analysis of the relation between the two hands of the *marginalia* of the *codex Veronensis* of Vergil (basically a relation of reciprocal integration, for the purposes of higher education) is proposed by Condello 2002.

and sees its first development in the Carolingian age, emphatically concluding that in late antiquity «in fatto di commenti, non troviamo che note isolate o anche serie di glosse, ma nulla di organico che corrisponda a una impaginazione concertata tra testo e glosse»⁵⁵. At this point I will mention two dissenting voices, which claim to perceive early signs of compilation in the sphere of the exegesis pertaining to Latin authors.

IXth c. manuscripts hand down evidence on two drafts of a commentary on the Virgilian *Bucolics*, both without the text of the poem, published by Hermann Hagen in the *Appendix Serviana*⁵⁶; the respective subscriptions attribute this work to the grammarian Iunius Filargirius (or Filagirus). Other *excerpta* of Filargirius can be found in the scholia *Bernensia*⁵⁷. The identity and chronology of the exegete are uncertain, but he is commonly believed to be a Vth c. Gallo-Roman (possibly Irish) grammarian⁵⁸. In a few notes, alternative explanations are separated by means of the adverb *aliter*, the use of which may go back to a compiler dating to earlier than the IXth c., or to Filargirius himself⁵⁹. The latter hypothesis is preferred by Wilson, who infers that *aliter* was already in use in Latin literary exegesis of late antiquity and concludes that Filargirius «did not himself invent this form of commentary More probably he took over a convenient feature of a Greek book that found its way into his hands»⁶⁰. As has been underlined in some studies, the traditional situation of medieval Virgilian scholia does not allow such a confident evaluation of the role of Filargirius in the formation of the *corpus*⁶¹. But even if one disregards this hesitation, I would argue that

55 Holtz 1995, 66; cf. 1984, 150 («J'en déduis que dans l'Antiquité, si l'on met à part le domaine du droit, celui justement qui a le plus rapidement exploité la forme de codex prise par le livre, les éditions commentées n'existent pas. ... Bref, en l'état actuel de notre documentation, nous ne rencontrons pas dans l'Antiquité tardive ce type de livres, si courant à l'époque carolingienne, qui ont été conçus pour contenir à la fois le texte principal et son commentaire»), 154-159; 2000, 108. A cautious position with respect to the origin of the scholia to the Latin authors is kept by Pecere 1986, 44-45.

56 Hagen 1902, 1-189.

57 Daintree/Geymonat 1988, 715.

58 Funaioli 1930, 398-399; Wilson 1967, 250; Geymonat 1985, 520; Kaster 1988, 284-285 (No. 60); Schmidt 1999.

59 The compiler of the Irish sylloge is perhaps to be identified as the abbot Adamnanus of Iona in Scotland (VIIth c.): Daintree/Geymonat 1988, 715.

60 Wilson 1967, 250. The hypothesis is accepted, as such, by McNamee 1998, 285; 2007, 82.

61 Zetzel 1975, 336 n. 6, while opting for Wilson's position, is aware that the complexity of the Filargirius' tradition hampers separation of the different layers; cf. also Daintree/Geymonat 1988, 713, 717.

Wilson's conjectures do not affect the main question we have been dealing with: that is to say, even if it could be ascertained that Filargirius made use of *aliter*, this would not suffice to demonstrate that his comment had a scholiastic form. Rather, it would simply confirm the ancient commentators' practice of setting beside one another different interpretations of the same passage, a practice that is well attested even in the remains of Greek *hypomnemata* on papyrus dating from the imperial age. As regards the hypothesis of a Greek origin of this use, with the suggestion that it was embraced by Filargirius, this remains purely speculative, receiving only fragile support by Wilson in the form of a sample of attestations of ἄλλως utilized to separate alternative opinions or pieces of information in Greek works of the Hellenistic and Roman age⁶². The ancient occurrences of the Greek adverb and of the corresponding Latin form, in the meaning we find in the medieval *corpora*, do not demonstrate any greater antiquity of the scholia themselves or of the scholiastic method, but only that the scholiasts utilized the adverb as a technical term, fixing it (or finding it already fixed) in an acceptation peculiar to learned vocabulary.

James Zetzel has shared in the debate by proposing an analysis of the codex Bembinus of Terence (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3226), a manuscript in Rustic Capitals of the IVth or Vth c., annotated by two VIth c. hands⁶³. The first hand wrote out roughly half of the notes to the *Andria* and the *Eunuchus* and a few of the notes to the *Heauton timorumenos*; the second annotator, at a distance of some decades, added the remaining notes to these three plays and all of the notes to the *Phormio* and *Adelphi*; *Hecyra* lacks *marginalia*. While in the opinion of Mountford, the editor of these scholia, the two hands drew on one and the same source (a draft of the commentary of Donatus, which has also come down to us independently)⁶⁴, Zetzel, in contrast, has tried to show that the two annotators made use of different models, and the second of more than one, thereby constructing a compilation of a scholiastic type (thus a *corpus* of scholia). Zetzel examines pairs of notes where the two annotators worked on the same passage, but is unable to isolate even a single definite case of derivation from

62 Wilson 1967, 251-252 (attestations in Chrysippus, Archimedes, Galen, Ammonius Grammaticus and in *sch. A. Pers.* 1 οἱ δὲ ἄλλως ὑπομνηματισθέντες φασιν κτλ.). For *aliter* he cites works of Jerome, demonstrating that «this heading was in use by c. A.D. 390 at the latest» (p. 251).

63 Zetzel 1975.

64 Mountford 1934.

different commentaries⁶⁵. Furthermore, if it is true that the second annotator availed himself of a number of sources as well as an edition of the commentary of Donatus, such sources should be seen within the framework of the variety of tools characteristic of the scholastic context, such as lexica and observations drawn from the spoken word of a master (some of the notes are accompanied by *dixit*). «The scribes of the Bembinus scholia – Zetzel observes – surely did not think that they were composing a commentary or even two commentaries; they were simply putting notes in the margins of their copy of Terence for private use. ... the Bembinus Terence, like so many other scholastic copies, was a private book, not a public edition»⁶⁶. Now, on one hand, precisely these characteristics of the Terentian manuscript evoke the features of papyrus fragments of Greek books from late antiquity rich in notes, reflecting a scholastic usage; and, on the other, they seem to differentiate the manuscript from later codices equipped with scholia, where a compilation of different commentaries was put together to build a super-commentary that could hardly have been a response to an individual and episodic educational circumstance. Finally, Zetzel believes that it is possible to recognize in other *marginalia* of the codex (in the section of notes to *Phorm.* 1–59) traces of their derivation from an abbreviated form of the commentary of Donatus set out in the margins of the model: «a copy of Terence with marginal scholia, therefore an abridgment of Donatus»⁶⁷. But Zetzel himself admits that none of the cases examined can be judged conclusive. And even if we were able to demonstrate that the origin of the *marginalia* of Bembinus is to be sought in a codex of this type, it is clear that not even this would be conclusive proof of a scholastic procedure in the pregnant sense defined at the outset of this paper: for the lost

65 Zetzel 1975, 344–352. In two cases, to *Eun.* 7 and 169, the two notes seem to put forward discordant interpretations, but it can be demonstrated that they coexisted in Donatus' comment (thus it is likely to have been an instance of "compilation" in a separate commentary, prior to the reduction to marginal notes). In other, more numerous cases, a repetitiveness of the two juxtaposed exegeses can be detected, which would seem to exclude their provenance from a single source (for example to *Eun.* 50, 57, 78). However, it may be cursorily added, none of the cases mentioned by Zetzel appears to be cogent: one cannot consider as mere "doubles" pairs of annotations consisting of an interlinear gloss of a single word and of a marginal note that includes the gloss, both of which evidently fulfil *different explanatory functions*; the same can be said for pairs in which a shorter note is incorporated in a literal manner within another longer and detailed note, which thus gives the impression of being a completion of the first one.

66 Zetzel 1975, 346–347.

67 Zetzel 1975, 348.

model would attest to the abridgment and transfer of a single separate commentary in the margins of the literary text. All in all: the codex Bembinus remains a copy annotated after a considerable length of time by two hands, each working individually, and certainly neither of them had any intention of composing a commentary or producing a compilation of different sources⁶⁸.

Above and beyond the alleged relations holding between the use of *aliter* and ἄλλως and the origin of the compilatory practice, as suggested by Wilson for the Virgilian exegesis of Filargirius, there can be no doubt that observation of this expedient in the medieval scholiastic *corpora* is extremely important in seeking to assess the compilatory techniques adopted by the annotators. Perhaps the most significant implication is the fact that compilation often makes it possible to place side by side explanations that are fully in agreement with each other as far as their contents are concerned, or even different drafts of the same explanation. Some have regarded this circumstance as a clear sign of the ignorance or superficial approach of the scholiasts⁶⁹, but I would argue that it should instead be likened to the twin practice found in the *catenae* and explicitly testified by the passage of Procopius of Gaza cited earlier (PG 87, col. 21). The author of the *catena* set himself the task of documenting interpretations that derived from different authors; thus he duly cited the appropriate *excerpta* from each commentary, at times paying little attention to whether they proved to be convergent or coinciding; indeed, he may conceivably have found nothing strange or useless at all in the emergence of exegetic convergences. If anything, it was practical considerations such as space-saving requirements and the readability of the *catena* that prompted the need to thin out or abridge some critical positions when they were shared by a number of exegetes. It is my belief that motives of this kind also underlie the typical repetitiveness of Greek scholia. Despite the fact that in general the scholia display a certain lack of interest in the memory of the exegetic sources, and accordingly employ ἄλλως as a marker signalling the transition between commentaries mostly left anonymous, the redundancy can be plausibly explained only as the fruit of a specific editorial intention of blanket scanning of the

68 Cf. C. E. Murgia *apud* Zetzel 1975, 343 n. 32: «Mechanically combining different commentaries that already exist side by side, written by different hands like the two hands of the Bembine, is only a scribal act, and is, I think, a more likely explanation of the diversity of sources of the Bembine scribes than any conscious hunting from one manuscript to another».

69 E.g. Erbse 1960, 170 («... die tōrichten Wiederholungen desselben Gedankens in verschiedener Formulierung, wie sie in den handschriftlich erhaltenen Scholien üblich sind...»); Wilson 2004, 129.

selected sources. What may seem uneconomic and superfluous or a sign of stupidity if weighed against an immediate practical aim (guaranteeing the reader an explanation or a series of coherent, rapid and effective explanations, without redundancies or repetitions) may, on the other hand, be meaningful if one takes the longer – in some sense philological – view, which recognizes in the earlier exegetic tradition a cultural heritage to be safeguarded and preserved in its multifaceted nature and specificity⁷⁰. Exhaustiveness and economy are polar criteria that pull the scholiast in opposite directions, subjecting him to a thankless *tour de force*, the outcome of which may fatally prove to be disappointing or unsatisfactory to anyone judging on the basis of different assumptions.

2.2.3. Annotated books of great format. Density of annotation and compilation

Kathleen McNamee has surveyed a class of large-format Greek papyrus codices of literary content dating from late antiquity, with broad margins (roughly from 6 to 10 cm), densely annotated by the same professional hand as the main text⁷¹. She proposes a possible relation of these books with Latin codices of legal content, likewise of large format and rich in bilingual Greek and Latin annotations, datable between the IVth c. and the Justinian age, found in Egypt but hypothetically springing, based on their codicological features and content, from an oriental school of law (like the highly renowned school in Beirut)⁷².

In McNamee's view, one of these Latin manuscripts, *PAnt.* III 153 (MP³ 2979.2), from the Vth or VIth c., arguably shows traces of exegetic compilation in the *marginalia*. The main text is framed by extensive annotations, and in fr. 2b, coll. I and II, it also presents two notes by the same hand to the same passage; the second note surrounds rightwards

70 The same assessment of the repetitiveness of the scholia is given by McNamee 2007, 86, who, however, extends it to *marginalia* of late antique codices as *POxy.* XX 2258, where the rare redundancies can be explained in a different manner (see *infra*, 2.2.3).

71 Cf. as early as Wilson 1967, 248-249. In the view of Messeri Savorelli/Pintaudi 2002, 56, «è ... questa identità di mano fra testo e commento che li apparenta ai codici medievali corredati di scolii, che datano a partire dal IX secolo, dei quali i codici papiracei possono essere gli antenati».

72 McNamee 1995; 1997; 1998; 2007, 79-81 (13 codices with a literary content, dated to between the IIIrd and VIth/VIIth c.; 14 legal codices, dated between the IVth/Vth and VIth c.). A previous mention of this typology of books is in Holtz 1984, 148 (the making of codices that were designed from the very outset to have marginal annotations «était courant, semble-t-il, dans un domaine qui a ses traditions propres, celui du droit»).

and below the first one, which implies that it was added later. This exterior set-up is consistent with a procedure of compilation from different sources⁷³. However, the text commented on and the associated context, as well as part of the two notes, are lost, so that it is impossible to determine whether the second note genuinely integrates or corrects the first and to what extent. Nor can it be excluded that the scribe drafted the first note by drawing isolatedly on the model of the main text, and then added the other one at a later time, when he was transcribing a commentary in the margins⁷⁴. No additional contribution can be obtained from the other marginal notes present on the papyrus, which are to a large extent mutilated, and in which no possible cases of compilation can be detected.

On this – somewhat fragile – basis, McNamee deduces that the large format with broad margins, the dense annotation and the compilation of distinct exegetic sources constitute special characteristics that are jointly present in the legal manuscripts listed in her study; and that the existence of codices of profane literature with similar codicological features and *mise en page*, dating from the same ages as the legal manuscripts and deriving from a nearby geographic area, testify to the adoption of that model in the context of literary book production, thus marking the birth of scholiography. This is, today, the most noteworthy and substantial point of the entire debate, and therefore more precise information is now needed in the effort to clear up several misunderstandings, before directing attention to the few genuinely significant cases.

There is a tendency to assume that if manuscripts dating from late antiquity display an extensive presence or elevated concentration of *marginalia*, especially if these are of an erudite nature, then such a phenomenon constitutes evidence in its own right of scholiastic compilatory practice⁷⁵. Yet an apparatus of notes, however long they may be, cannot – in the absence of an editorial criterion of a compilatory nature designed to gather together and amalgamate different interpretations – be identified with what we have defined as a *corpus* of scholia. The quantity of the annotation by no means reduces the typological distance between

73 McNamee 1995, 407; 2007, 83 (508–509 for the text; Pl. XXIX).

74 This is again likely to be a case not of an “editorial”, but a “scribal act”: see *supra*, n. 68.

75 E.g. Wilson 1967, 248, on POxy. XX 2258: «the learning displayed is certainly consistent with the view that the notes draw on more than one hypomnema». McNamee 2007, 82: «We must consider now whether any of the long marginalia in late literary texts, which look so scholiastic sometimes in their density, resemble catenae and scholia in this particular way», *scil.* in engaging in the compilation of different exegetic sources.

the simple and in some way mechanical operation of jotting down a comment in the margins and the scholiastic editorial technique. A few cases lend themselves to misinterpretation, as for instance the very extended note concerning legal terminology (on the word *indicium*) that occupies part of the external and lower margin of a surviving leaf of a IVth or Vth c. Latin codex containing Cicero's *Divinatio in Q. Caecilium* (P^Ryl. III 477)⁷⁶. The case is underscored by McNamee as «an intermediate stage between the ancient practice of transmitting commentaries as independent books and the Byzantine practice of transcribing them as marginal scholia»⁷⁷. More simply, I think, this note is an *excerptum*, drawn directly from an exegetic work, or the written record of an oral comment. Its breadth, admittedly unusual in comparison to known evidence but also to the other surviving *marginalia* of the same codex, seems to be a response to some contingent need and availability of explication by the user of the manuscript, rather than reflecting a broad-ranging programmatic intent.

By the same token, mention should be made here, in order to exclude them from the question at hand, of some papyrus scrolls displaying a set-up that McNamee defines as «proto-scholiastic combinations of text and commentary»⁷⁸, but which have as their main feature the co-presence of literary text and the associated explanation, without any trace of editorial compilation from different commentaries. The exemplars in question are well known as they present particularly unusual editorial structures: PLille 82; 76 + 79; 78b; 78a (MP³ 207.03, IIIrd-IInd c. B.C.), a line by line comment of an elegy of Callimachus; PLouvre 7733 (MP³ 2911, IInd c. B.C.), the “elegy of the oyster” with a commentary; POxy. XII 1276 (MP³ 1172, Ist c. A.D.), book 2 of the *Iliad* with interlinear paraphrase; and POxy. XIX 2221 (MP³ 1327, Ist c. A.D.), a commentary on Nicander's *Theriaca*⁷⁹. While it is true that in these cases the scribes' intent coincided with that of the scholiasts with regard to the aim of presenting the entire literary text accompanied by the corresponding exegesis, it is nevertheless inexact to speak of proto-scholiography: for we are still within a basic context of continuous paraphrasis (for the *Iliad* papyrus) and commentary (in the other three cases) alternating with the literary text. These are formal variants that seek to overcome the practical difficulty of combining on the same page a text

76 McNamee 1995, 400; 2007, 34 (473–478 for the text; Pl. XXVI–XXVII).

77 McNamee 1995, 402–403.

78 McNamee 2007, 17–18, where the reader may also find related bibliographic references.

79 On the last one see Andorlini 2003, 17–18.

and its interpretation. The label “commentated edition”⁸⁰ appears particularly effective and apt for such variants. The authorial comments transcribed in (or destined *ab origine* to) the margins of the work commented upon, without this implying an editorial activity of compiling from different sources, can also be included within this type⁸¹.

Other texts or text types are habitually adduced – improperly, in my view – as evidence in support of compilatory activity in ancient exegetic *marginalia* of Greek literary works. It is worth underlining here that the examples quoted are often not strictly speaking literary works or are not treated as such by their users: rather, they belong to the pragmatic-professional and paraliterary spheres of medicine, mathematics, philosophy, law and the *Scriptures*, the specificity of which was emphasized at the opening of the present paper⁸². On this point Wilson, in *Scholars of Byzantium*, dealing with the celebrated Vienna codex containing the herbarium of Dioscorides surrounded by a marginal text apparatus – to which we will return shortly – states: «It might be argued that scribal practices in the preparation of scientific texts were not necessarily the same as for more literary authors, and that the herbal of Dioscorides, being a practical book essential to doctors and evidently frequently copied, should not be equated with texts of poets. But there is no evidence of such a distinction being drawn between scientific and literary texts, and the medical profession was in any case largely composed of cultivated men and recognized as such»⁸³. Now, I would rather claim some genuine difference between the literary and the scientific-professional documentation that has come down to us, mainly because of the unlike contexts and institutions in which they circulated and were utilized. Thus on the one hand we find the schools, where the activity involved reading and providing a predominantly language and content-related commentary on a traditionally defined set of authors and works, such activity being designed to furnish general training and to define models of style; on the other, we have the professional specialties and the philosophical and religious speculations, with goals, practical requirements and quite distinct socio-cultural implications of their own. Medicine, mathematics, philosophy, law and the *Scriptures* are (highly) specialist branches of cultural enquiry: their reception and vicissitudes in book

80 Most recently Montanari 2006, 11–14, who examines in particular *PFay.* 3 (Aristoteles, *Topica*), from the end of the Ist c. A.D., and *PLille* of Callimachus. Cf. also Messeri Savorelli/Pintaudi 2002, 46–49, who add the Derveni papyrus.

81 See the examples mentioned *supra*, n. 3.

82 *Supra*, 1.3.

83 Wilson 1983a, 35.

production and tradition cannot be made to coincide directly with the history of literary texts that were read and explained within the context of ordinary school education.

This having been stated, the fields of medicine and philosophy also cover a few examples of presumed exegetic compilation which do not properly consist in explanatory *marginalia*, but rather are extracts from works belonging to the same genre as the work to which the commentary refers, arranged in the margin of the text in such a way as to form a sort of desultory apparatus of *loci similes*. An interesting case of this type is the above mentioned manuscript of Dioscorides, Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, med. gr. 1 (ca. 512), a parchment codex probably from Constantinople⁸⁴, in which Wilson recognizes an embryonic form of scholia⁸⁵. The frequent citation of medical prescriptions taken from works of Galen and Crateuas (which in the foll. 27r, 30r, 33r and 40r occur in pairs⁸⁶) serves *in primis* to supply parallels from authors of repute on particular aspects addressed in the main text. The same situation arises, it would appear, in papyrus codex fragments concerning medical subjects, dating from late antiquity, which exhibit parallels in the margins⁸⁷. Such an arrangement is clearly different from scholiastic annotation, which obeys a subordinate and ancillary function with respect to the main text, but it also differs from the *catena*, which juxtaposes interventions performed by various authors, often expressly nominated, inasmuch as they are *exegetes* of the main (here biblical) text.

A mirror image case, no less frequently than improperly cited in the quest for a precedent of scholiastic practice, is that testified by the neoplatonic Marinus (*Vita Procli* 27, 11–19) who, in Vth c. Athens, asked Proclus to annotate with his own readings (*scholia*) the margins of an exemplar of the commentaries (*hypomnemata*) of Syrianus on the Orphic songs⁸⁸. Since the main text itself is an exegetic work (philosophical

84 *Facsimile* with commentary: Gerstinger 1970. More recent integral *facsimile* reproduction: Mazal 1998. On the Viennese manuscript as a luxury copy created originally to embellish the private library of an aristocrat, see Cavallo 2002, 188–189.

85 Wilson 1971, 558; cf. 1983a, 34; 1984, 108; Irigoin 1994, 78 and 136 (discussion with H. Maehler); McNamee 2007, 89, 91.

86 Wilson 1971, 558, places excessive emphasis on this circumstance: «The use of material from more than one source in this way is a most important step in the formation of marginal scholia».

87 Andorlini 2000, 42–44; cf. 2003, 26–28.

88 ... ἡξίωσα [γὰρ] παραγράφειν αὐτὸν τὰ ἀρέσκοντα τοῖς τοῦ διδασκάλου (scil. Συριανοῦ) βιβλίοις· πεισθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοειδεστάτου, καὶ παραγράψαντος τοῖς μετώποις τῶν ὑπομνημάτων, ἔσχομεν συναγωγὴν εἰς

commentaries of a continuous type, separate from the text commented upon), it seems correct to interpret this aggregate as an exegetic stratification, in which the main text and the *marginalia* build up a sum of materials belonging to the same genre: renowned authorial commentary accompanied by authorial *addenda*⁸⁹, not an editorial compilation of other writers' comments⁹⁰. This type of stratification in ancient commentaries is likely to have been a common practice, overall intrinsically characteristic of the open works of erudite literature, and it can be observed in action in ancient *hypomnemata* as well, albeit episodically and not in such a massive proportions as could perhaps be imagined for the Syrianus' exemplar⁹¹. Robert Devreesse hypothesized that a similar exegetic stratification, i.e. particularly authoritative comments contained in

ταὐτὸν ἀπάντων, καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ εἰς Ὀρφέα αὐτοῦ σχόλια καὶ ὑπομνήματα στίχων οὐκ ὀλίγων κτλ., «... je le priais de bien vouloir consigner ses opinions en marge des livres de Syrianus. Comme notre maître, image parfaite du Bien, en a convenu et qu'il a mis des notes dans les marges des commentaires de Syrianus, nous avons ainsi obtenu dans le même livre une collection de toutes leurs opinions; et ainsi il y a des scholies et commentaires de Proclus aussi sur Orphée, qui contiennent beaucoup de lignes etc.» (text and translation by Saffrey/Segonds 2001). Neither the noun σχόλια nor the forms of the verb παραγράφειν imply a product analogous to what we have defined a *corpus* of scholia: see *infra*, 2.2.4 with n. 153; Montana 2010.

- 89 Precisely σχόλια in the words of Marinus, namely “reports of readings” (oral lectures held by Proclus himself on the Orphic poems with the help of Syrianus' commentary), according to the meaning of the term argued for the field of neoplatonic exegesis by Lamberz 1987 (*supra*, n. 2). Nothing odd that the *Suda* lists as independent works Proclus' εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως θεολογίαν (π 2473 Adler) and Syrianus' εἰς τὴν Ὀρφέως θεολογίαν βιβλία δύο (σ 1662 Adler).
- 90 Cf. Zuntz 1975, 77. A symmetrical case is attested to again by Marinus (*Vita Procli* 12) about the composition of Proclus' *hypomnemata* to Plato's *Phaedo*, made up by records ἀπὸ φωνῆς of the lectures of Plutarch of Athens and then implemented (συμπληρωθέντων τῶν σχολίων) by Proclus himself till they became “original” commentaries (ὑπομνήματα) of his own. Likewise, it seems, the commentary to Hesiod's *Works and Days* ascribed to Proclus was in fact a remake of the *hypomnema* to the poem written by Plutarch of Chaeronea: Faraggiana 1978, 1981, and 1987, 21 (Proclus' *hypomnema* was nearly «une nouvelle édition revue et augmentée» of the commentary composed by Plutarch) and 22 («Un procédé de ce genre devait être assez normal au V^e s. après J.-C., où, à l'Académie, on lisait d'habitude (suivant l'exemple de Plotin) au cours des leçons sur un texte “classique” les commentaires déjà disponibles»). Faraggiana (*ibidem*, 26–27) stresses the eclectic nature of Proclus' commentaries.
- 91 E.g. POxy. XXXI 2536, Theon's commentary to Pindar's *Pythian Odes*; PFlor. II 112, anonymous commentary to an unidentified comedy by Aristophanes (on the latter cf. Montana 2006a, 183–211: Aristophanes 28 CLGP).

the marginal annotations to a main commentary of repute, lay at the origin of the biblical *catenae*⁹². Analogously, as insightfully suggested by Antonietta Porro, rather than being a formal antecedent of scholiography, the manuscript of Syrianus annotated by Proclus may instead well represent an example of the type of sources utilized by the medieval scholiasts⁹³.

A final category of exegetic pseudocompilation includes papyrus codices in which different hands at different times intervened to write annotations in the margins. One cannot speak of genuine compilation when the sum of exegetic materials does not reflect a unitary and programmatic editorial intention, stemming instead from the succession of interventions by owners or readers of the manuscript, in which case the *marginalia* are the expression of distinct and episodic moments that prompted the need to provide an explanation for some aspect of the text. What we have in such cases is, more simply, a re-utilization of the same manuscript by a multiplicity of subjects, each working with the same aim and the same manner of proceeding as we find documented in the manuscripts annotated by a single hand. Among the most significant examples we may mention *POxy.* XXI 2295 (MP³ 63), from a Ist c. scroll containing works of Alcaeus with notes written by at least three hands⁹⁴; the Pindaric scroll *POxy.* V 841 (MP³ 1361), of the IInd c., with marginal and interlinear notes traceable to perhaps five different hands⁹⁵; two Aristophanean papyri from Vth c. codices, *BKT* IX 5 (remains of the *Knights*) and *POxy.* XI 1371 (beginning of the *Clouds*), featuring *marginalia* to be assigned to at least two and four hands respectively⁹⁶; and two Latin codices, the fragment *PAnt. s.n.* (MP³ 2925)⁹⁷

92 Devreesse 1928, 1089-1090 and 1092; see *supra*, n. 46 (Jewish *Talmud* and biblical *catenae*).

93 Porro 1985, 213-214; cf. Cavallo 1986, 96, who however seems inclined to assimilate this type of stratification to scholiastic compilation, as well as e.g. Hoffmann 2000, 624-627; Saffrey/Segonds 2001, 150-151; Pontani 2005b, 99; Cufalo 2007, LXXXI-LXXXII.

94 Porro 2004, 125-135 (Alcaeus 7 CLGP); McNamee 2007, 148-151, Pl. IX-X.

95 It is impossible to say whether the two notes to *Pae.* 2.31-34 (notes *b* and *c*), written perhaps by the same hand, actually concern the same topic and derive from different sources: so also McNamee 2007, 83-86 (the text of the notes is at 328-329).

96 Montana 2006a, 57-66 and 84-93 (Aristophanes 6 and 13 CLGP); Montana 2006c; McNamee 2007, 185-187, Pl. XXIV, and 188-190, Pl. XXII. The *marginalia* of both Aristophanean papyri are considered by Silke Trojahn to be precursors («Vorläufer») of the scholia: Trojahn 2002, 226; *contra* Montana 2005, 13-15.

97 Roberts 1935; McNamee 2007, 479-490.

containing Juvenal's *Satires*, from the Vth or VIth c., with marginal and interlinear notes by four hands, and the codex Bembinus of Terence, mentioned earlier, whose notes can be attributed to two different hands⁹⁸.

In this context it is helpful to underline some *mise en page* characteristics of codices from late antiquity that in all probability belong to the large-format book type identified by McNamee, with broad margins and a high frequency of annotation. The above cited *BKT* IX 5 and *POxy.* XI 1371, fragments of comedies of Aristophanes with *marginalia* together with evident traces of exegetic stratification by more than one hand, both present lateral margins having unequal width and apparently specialized for different purposes⁹⁹: the right-hand margin (indifferently external or internal), which is wider, is used for content-related explanations of greater extension, while the left-hand margin, narrower, is devoted to hosting *notae personarum*, *parepigraphai* and glosses¹⁰⁰. It seems quite natural to attribute this structuring of the page to specific reading requirements, which in the case of drama call for a paratextual apparatus specifying the attribution of the speeches to the various characters of the play¹⁰¹. These cases delineate a *habitus* that is "intermediate" between the practice that involved simply jotting down *marginalia* drawn from a written or oral source, and the practice of scholiastic compilation represent-

98 Cf. Papathomás 2003, 272–273; *supra*, 2.2.2.

99 On the specialisation of the margins with regard to the type of notes they host, see McNamee 2007, 15–18: in the scrolls, the textual notes and the corrector's interventions are normally found on the left of the main text, glosses and brief metaphrases are placed in the interlinear position, explanatory notes referring to the content are on the right of the column and in the upper and lower margins. The codices tend to repeat the same arrangement, except for a variation in the function of the lateral margins: the external margin lends itself to paratextual annotations (like short titles), usable by the reader as he leafs through the pages.

100 Cf. Montana 2006a, 8–9. Images of *BKT* IX 5: Zuntz 1975, Pl. Ia (*PBerol.* inv. 13929v), Ib (*PBerol.* inv. 21105v); Cavallo/Maehler 1987, 57 No. 24c 1–2 (*PBerol.* inv. 21105r–v); Ioannidou 1996, Pl. I (*PBerol.* inv. 21105r–v); Montana 2006a, Tab. VII (a) (*PBerol.* inv. 13929r); McNamee 2007, Pl. XXIV (all); of *POxy.* XI 1371: Grenfell/Hunt 1915, Pl. VII (→); Cavallo/Maehler 1987, 41, No. 16a (→); <http://www.columbia.edu/cgi-bin/cul/apis> (↓); McNamee 2007, Pl. XXII (↓).

101 In this aspect, the codices designed for reading effectively replicate the arrangement typical of dramatic scripts, which involved the sigla of the actors on the left-hand side of their lines: cf. Gammacurta 2006, especially 240–247. It should be kept in mind that the asymmetric *mise en page* is not an exclusive feature of dramatic texts, but is found, for example, in a papyrus codex of Callimachus (*PBerol.* inv. 13417, IVth/Vth c.).

ing the outcome of an editorial project; they may conceivably have been copies destined to public use (in libraries) and may stem from a background of more elevated cultural contexts (of a rhetorical type, if not philological) than the second level of school training.

Once we have eliminated these by no means few cases in which the *marginalia* can only superficially be likened to scholiastic *corpora*, what remains to be examined are the fragments of three late papyrus codices, datable to between the end of the IVth and the VIIth c., which are adduced by McNamee as proof that a compilatory practice in the marginal exegesis of profane authors did exist earlier than the IXth c.¹⁰² Two of these papyri, magnificent exemplars of Callimachus and Theocritus, are instances of the type of large-format codex with dense marginal annotation individuated by McNamee.

POxy. XX 2258 (MP³ 186), first published by Edgar Lobel in 1952, has come to take on a fundamental role in the question¹⁰³. This is a papyrus codex in Alexandrian majuscule from between the end of the VIth and the beginning of the VIIth c., of which there remain quite substantial fragments containing works of Callimachus densely annotated in the margins by the same hand as that of the main text (we will return below to the handwriting of the *marginalia*)¹⁰⁴. This is a book which certainly does not reflect a low level of schooling; rather, it very likely belonged to an erudite¹⁰⁵, and its construction demonstrates an innovative intention in the joint *mise en page* of the literary text and the associated commentary. In his Callimachean edition, Rudolf Pfeiffer observed: «qui ea scholia in Aegypto composuit, ex ὑπομνημάτων voluminibus variam doctrinam collegit, complures ad eundem locum explicationes necnon aliorum scriptorum testimonia diligenter attulit»¹⁰⁶, thus making a statement which, being no less categorical than it is generic, encouraged the idea of the existence of the typically scholiastic compilatory procedure

102 Cf. McNamee 2007, 83–86.

103 Perhaps too much has been made of this papyrus, to the point of turning it into a “fetish”: it remains an isolated case, both as regards the density of the annotation (Zuntz 1975, 131; Maehler 1994, 126 and 137, discussion with J. Irigoin), and also from a codicological point of view (Maniaci 2002, 16 n. 1).

104 Images: Lobel 1952, Pl. XIII–XVI; http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/papyri/the_papyri.html; see also Turner/Parsons 1987, Pl. 47 (fr. C2v); Cavallo 2000, Pl. 1 (fr. C2v).

105 Cf. Porro 1985, 211 n. 113.

106 Pfeiffer 1949–1953, II XXVII.

even in the early Byzantine era¹⁰⁷. The first detailed observation of the *marginalia* of the fragment in this perspective was carried out by Antonietta Porro, who in an important article that appeared in *Storia e civiltà* in 1985 conducted an in-depth codicological and paleographic examination of this manuscript and of others of a similar type, devoting a specific *Excursus* to the question¹⁰⁸. Her position can be summarized as follows: (1) among the annotations one can distinguish simple glosses and, predominantly, slightly fuller notes on the literal meaning or the content of the text, always preceded by a lemma, which is the mark of derivation from a separate *hypomnema* (especially since in two cases the lemma gives *varia lectio* compared to the main text); (2) the *mise en page* involves shorter notes in the lateral margins and other longer notes in the lower margin (the upper margin of the extant fragments is not in a condition that would allow any precise idea as to its utilisation); the basic distinction between the two types of notes, apart from the glosses, resides not in the content but in their size, and this aspect has to be ascribed to a choice made by the annotator and not to the use of different sources; (3) in four circumstances the same point of the text is explained by two distinct *marginalia*: in three of these cases, one of the two kindred notes, namely the shorter of the pair, is situated in a lateral margin while the other, the longer one, is placed in the lower margin; and in the fourth case, one note is in the internal and the other in the external margin. But in none of these pairs is there a note providing information that contrasts with the other member of the pair, which would have revealed a provenance from different commentaries; the scribe has placed in the lower margin (and possibly he did the same with regard to the upper margin) the annotations that could not fit into the lateral margins because they were too long or because those margins were already occupied by shorter notes on the same point of the text of the poem. The partial duplication of some annotations in the lower and in the lateral margin is seen as a response to the scribe's intention of not depriving the reader of a quick glance at the explanatory help placed close by the text¹⁰⁹. Therefore, Porro concludes, «A titolo d'ipotesi, credo che

107 Especially Wilson 1967, 248–249 (more cautiously, Wilson 1983a, 34: «... though it may not be an amalgam of commentaries in the way that scholia normally are ...»; cf. 1984, 108: «That may have been a case of a single monograph rather than amalgamation»). Zuntz 1975, 131–132 (*Nachwort*), although acknowledging the special case of the Oxyrhynchus codex, believes that his main thesis is not undermined; cf. Erbse 1960, 170–171.

108 Porro 1985, 208–215.

109 This possibility is not excluded by McNamee 2007, 86, who, however, comes to the opposite conclusion.

l'indole e la disposizione di questi *scholia* potrebbe essere ben spiegata supponendo come loro fonte un unico *hypomnema*, piuttosto pregevole sul piano dell'erudizione, da cui un compilatore avrebbe estratto le varie sezioni ponendole, finché era possibile, accanto ai versi da commentare e aggiungendovi forse brevi glosse di altra provenienza o di propria iniziativa. (...) mai si può dimostrare che, all'interno di un lemma, siano compresenti notizie di diversa provenienza»¹¹⁰.

A diametrically opposite conclusion is reached in the subsequent and repeated analyses performed by McNamee, who is inclined to recognize some of the notes of the Callimachean codex as the result of compilation¹¹¹. Unfortunately she does not cite and is apparently not aware of Porro's remarks¹¹². We will dwell here on the annotations involved¹¹³.

1) Callim. fr. 110, 67 Pf. (*Coma Berenices*) (C fr. 1v), notes *c b* McNamee:

Ἰπρόcθε μὲν ἔρχόμεν . . μετ'οπωρινὸν ἸΩκ|ξανόνδε

c) mg. dx. (int.)

⁷ πρ[ό]cθε μὲν ἔρχ(ομεν-)

¹⁰ τῇ μὲν μετ'οπωρινῇ ἱcημερία

¹¹ ἔωθεν ἀνα-

¹² τελλοντ . . [τροπῇ δὲ

¹³]θερινῇ ἔωθεν δυνοντ[-

¹⁴] Ἡcιοδοc ἀν(α)τ(έλλ-), κατ' εὐθεΐα[ν

¹⁵ δὲ δυνοντ . [

¹⁰ μετ'οπωρινῇ corr. Lobel;]μερινῇcημερία pap. «(prob. icη]μερινῇcημερία per 'dittographiam', non χει]μερινῇcημερία)» Pfeiffer; «χει]μερινῇ (leg. μετ'οπωρινῇ)» MacNamee

coming (?) before: ris(?) in the East in the equinox of autumn and set(?) in the East [in the solstice] of summer ... [according to?] Hesiod (fr. 292 M.-W.) [Bootes?] ris(?) ..., set(?) vertically (?).

110 Porro 1985, 212.

111 McNamee 1977, 241-255; 1995, 407-409; 2007, 34 and 83-84. McNamee's conclusions are upheld, e.g., by Messeri Savorelli/Pinaudi 2002, 56; Papathomas 2003, 281 with n. 110.

112 Perhaps one may see a tacit allusion to an observation by Porro in the expression «Others have noted the absence here of ἄλλως ...» (McNamee 2007, 84; cf. Porro 1985, 211).

113 In few points, registered in the apparatuses, I don't follow the edition by McNamee 2007.

b) *mg. inf.*

³⁶

πρόσθε μὲν ἔρχομεν ὅπως ..: κοινῇ .[

³⁷

... []τε τῆς ἀν[α]τολῆς κ(αὶ) τῆς δύσεως. ἀνατέλλ[ει] μὲν γάρ

φ(ησιν) ὁ Πλόκαμ(ος) πρ[ὸ] τῆς μετοπωρινῆς ἱσημε-

³⁸

ρίας, δύνει] δὲ μετὰ [τῇ]ν ἑαρινὴν ἱσημερινῶν.

37-38 πρ[ὸ] τῆς μετοπωρινῆς ἱσημε|ρίας Pfeiffer; πρ[ὸ] τῆς χειμερινῆς τροπῆς Lobel (followed by MacNamee)

coming (?) before ... : together ... of the rise and of the setting. In effect Coma – he says – rises before [the autumn equinox, it sets] after the spring equinox.

In the lacunose Callimachean passage a relation was established between the setting of Coma and that of Bootes¹¹⁴. Modern astronomy has calculated that around the middle of the IIIrd c. B.C. Coma was visible in Egypt from the beginning of September and Bootes towards the end of the same month; the former went down after the spring equinox and the latter towards the beginning of summer¹¹⁵. The constellation mentioned in the first note of the papyrus rises in the autumn equinox and sets in the summer (solstice); the other note explains that Coma rises before (the autumn equinox) and sets after the spring equinox. In McNamee's view the first annotation likewise refers to Coma, and it can be deduced from the discrepancy in the content of the two *marginalia* that they derive from different commentaries and therefore provide evidence of exegetic compilation¹¹⁶. By contrast, Lobel and Pfeiffer believe that the first note refers to Bootes, which was presumably the object of the Hesiodic testimony cited (since the constellation later consecrated to Berenice was not known to the archaic poet)¹¹⁷. It must therefore be concluded, in agreement with Antonietta Porro, that the two *marginalia* are neither in contradiction with each other nor alternative, but rather «uno integrazione dell'altro», and therefore they may stem from the very same commentary¹¹⁸.

114 The reference to Bootes in the Callimachean text is reconstructed thanks to the imitation by Catullus (66, 67) and to the marginal note to ll. 65-68 of this Oxyrhynchus papyrus.

115 Pfeiffer 1949-1953, I 120 (apparatus).

116 McNamee 2007, 84 («slightly different information»).

117 Furthermore McNamee 2007, 211, likewise gives Lobel's translation of the note, in which reference is made to Bootes.

118 Porro 1985, 210 n. 111.

2) Callim. fr. 384, 4 Pf. (Σωσιβίου νίκη) (C fr. 2v), notes *a* *b* McNamee:

ῥ τὸ μὲν ἐξ Ἐφιύρης ἄρμα₁ σελινοφόρον

a) mg. sn. (int.)

⁷ ῥ: ῥτινι· τῶ

⁸ ὦσιβίῳ

to whom: *to whomever: to Sosibius*

b) mg. inf.

²⁶ ῥ τὸ μὲν ἐξ Ἐφύρης: ῥτινι· τῶ ὦσιβίῳ· Ἐφύρα δὲ ἡ Κόρινθος·

σελινοφ[όρ]ον δὲ ἔφη τὸ ῥ[μα]

²⁷ διὰ τὸν σ]τέφανον· οἱ γὰρ νικῶντες τὰ Ἴσθμια σελίνῳ στέφονται

to whom from] Ephrya: *to whomever: to Sosibius. Ephrya is Corinth. He has called the chariot "bearer of wild celery" [on account of the] crown, because the winners of the Isthmian Games are crowned with wild celery*

The repetition of the initial part of the two notes is seen by McNamee as evidence «that the scribe was copying from two different sources, since it would be normal enough for a copyist to transcribe, unthinkingly, whatever he found under his nose, even if it entailed duplication»¹¹⁹. This argument is clearly tautological, because it presupposes the assumption it aims to demonstrate: namely, the contention that the scribe copied from more than one source is claimed to be demonstrated by the fact that he passively compiled models that happened to partially coincide with one another. Considering the very low percentage of repetition in the *marginalia* of the Callimachean papyrus, it is necessary first of all to examine whether they answer some internal purposes of the exegetical apparatus. In the case under examination, the scribe is likely to have repeated the same annotation in a more brief and essential form in the lateral margin, as close as possible to the word to which it refers, for no other reason than «per facilitare la comprensione del testo da parte del lettore»¹²⁰.

119 McNamee 2007, 84.

120 Porro 1985, 210.

3) Callim. fr. 384, 23-24 Pf. (Σωσιβίου νίκη) (C fr. 2r), notes *b a* McNamee:

ὄφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις Ἀλεξάνδρου τε πύθεται
γῆν ἐπὶ καὶ ναίων Κίνυφι διστεφέα

b) mg. dx. (int.)

⁹ Κίνυψ ποταμὸς τῆς Λιβύης[*c*].

¹⁰ ἵνα οὖν αὐτ[ὸν]

¹¹ καὶ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς καὶ Λί-

¹² βυες ἀκούσῳσιν διστεφέα

Kinyps (is) a river of Libya. Therefore, "so that both the Alexandrians and the Libyans know that he was crowned twice"

a) mg. inf.

²⁹

ὄφρα κε Σωσίβιον τις: ἵνα

κ(αὶ) τῆς τοῦ Σωσιβίου νίκης ἀκού-

³⁰ σῳσιν κ(αὶ) οἱ πόρρω οἰκοῦντες ἐπὶ τῷ Κίνυφι, μὴ μόνον οἱ ἐν

Ἀλεξανδρ[ε]ῖα. Κίν[υψ]

³¹] /// . νος τῆς ἀρ. ἔως ὀρίζων τὴν Καρχη[δ]ονίων χώραν.

ἔστι δὲ κ(αὶ) πόλις . [

³²] διστεφέα δὲ διὰ τὸ δις νικῆσαι τὸν Σωσίβιον

because Sosibius who: *so that likewise with regard to the [victory] of Sosibius [news can be conveyed even to those] who live far from Kinyps, and not only to whoever lives in Alexandria. Kinyps ... which delimits the land of the Carthaginians. There is also a city ... διστεφέα because Sosibius won twice*

The shorter note, set in the right-hand margin, succinctly explains that Kinyps is a river in Libya and offers a paraphrase of the Callimachean couplet, in which the twofold poetic periphrasis «both those who live in the land of Alexander and near Kinyps» is translated with «both the Alexandrians and the Libyans»: one term only, for each periphrastic member of the poetic text. The longer note, set in the lower margin of the page, begins instead with a paraphrase that dilates the statement contained in the verse formulation, rendering explicit the adversative character of the correlation ... τε ... καὶ (κ(αὶ) οἱ) πόρρω οἰκοῦντες ἐπὶ τῷ Κίνυφι, μὴ μόνον οἱ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρ[ε]ῖα); it then follows by identifying Kinyps as that which marks the boundary between the Ptolemaic lands and the Carthaginian domains. There can be little doubt that this geographic entity must be the river, like in the other note, particularly in the light of the subsequent specification «There is also a city... », *scilicet* called Kinyps. The last line deals with a different topic (the adjective διστεφέα). While it is true that the two notes are not identical to each other in their structure but specular, even in this case we observe that

the note in the lateral margin presents, in a more succinct and pared down form, the same information as that contained in the other. In sum, we cannot deduce with absolute certainty that they derive from different commentaries: the shorter note could be the outcome of adapting the same exegetic comment to the reduced space of the lateral margin, in order to serve a practical purpose, namely that of a quick aid to reading and interpretation of the poetic text.

4) Callim. fr. 384, 25-26 Pf. (Σωσιβίου νίκη) (C fr. 2r), notes *b a* McNamee:

ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ παιδί, κασιγνήτω τε Λεάρχου
καὶ τὸ Μυριναῖον τῷ γάλα θησαμένω

b) interl. (ad l. 25 κασιγνήτω)

τῷ Μελ[ι]κέρτη

Melicertes

a) mg. dx. (int.)

13 ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ
14 παιδ<ί>: τὸν Μελι-
15 κέρτην λέγ(ει) καὶ τὸν Ἀρχέμο-
16 ρον. ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ Μελικέρ-
17 τη τίθεται τὰ
18 Ἰσθμια, ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ
19 Ἀρχεμόρῳ τὰ Νεμέα

14 παιδ<ί>: παιδος pap.

alongside both of the children: he means Melicertes and Archemorus: for the Isthmian Games are established in honour of Melicertes and the Nemean Games in honour of Archemorus.

Frankly it is hard to see how the repetition of the name Melicertes, as an interlinear gloss and in the marginal note, can be taken as a sign of compilation of different commentaries¹²¹. This example is, if anything, instructive of the scribe's manner of proceeding: at least in these few cases that are observable in the papyrus and which we have examined here, he was concerned with differentiating the degree of transcription and reduction of his exegetic source in such a way as to optimize its use and fully exploit its effectiveness. Thus brief notes and glosses extracted from the original commentary are condensed and placed at the side or in the

121 Understandably, Porro 1985 does not take the case into consideration. Cf. also *supra*, 2.2.2. with n. 65 (glosses in the codex Bembinus of Terence).

interlinear spaces of the poetic text, for the purpose of providing quick help; any wider-ranging explanations drawn more generously and literally from the commentary are reserved to the spacious lower margin of the page¹²².

5) A final pair of annotations present in *POxy. XX 2258* and concerning the same point of the Callimachean text, which escaped McNamee's attention, is mentioned by Porro:

Callim. fr. 110, 53 Pf. (*Coma Berenices*) (C fr. 1r), notes *e d* McNamee:

ἴετο κυκλώσας βαλιὰ πτερά θῆλυς ἀήτης

e) mg. dx. (ext.), beside l. 12

θῆλυς ἀήτης:] . ρ α . [
 . ἔστιν[.] καὶ α[] ινπα[
] traces

female breeze: ...

d) mg. sn. (int.)

¹¹ θῆλυς δὲ ἀήτης

¹² δ]ιὰ τὸ γόνιμον

¹³ π]νοῦς ἀπαλόος

11 ἀήτης: αὐτ̣ pap.

the breeze (is said to be) female because it is fertile: gentle breath

Determining the content of the first annotation and thus evaluating in what relation it stands to the second one is an extremely challenging task. Because of the exchange of αὐτ̣(ῆς) for ἀήτης, one may wonder whether the second note was jotted down by the scribe ἀπὸ φωνῆς, that is to say, upon hearing it from a commentator who was orally explaining the text or was reading a *hypomnema* aloud. The particle δέ interposed between the two poetic words is therefore probably a reflection of the syntactic dictate of the *hypomnema*¹²³ or of the oral explanation, and I would not rule out the possibility of seeing it as a clue indicating that this note is the completion of the other. In effect, since the

122 McNamee 1995, 408, additionally included, among the notes of *POxy. XX 2258* presumed to be the outcome of compilation, two *marginalia* referring to fr. 384, 22 Pf. (notes *a* and *b* in McNamee 2007, 217): but the shorter note (*mg. dx. = int.*) is a paraphrase of the Callimachean line, while the longer one (*mg. inf.*) explains its content. This, I presume, accounts for the abandonment of the case in McNamee 2007.

123 Thus Porro 1985, 209 n. 110.

note on the right is placed exactly alongside the pair of words that are the object of the explanation, it was in all probability penned in first; we can therefore presume that it provided a summary identification with Zephyrus of the winged breath mentioned in the text. The note on the left, symmetrical with the other with respect to the text of the poem and further away from the words $\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$, deals exclusively with the meaning of the attribute: « $\acute{\alpha}\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ (is said) $\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\varsigma$ on account of its being fertile etc.». Therefore it is preferable to keep the two notes in the order in which we present them here, which is also that adopted by Pfeiffer¹²⁴.

Let us now summarize the situation displayed by this papyrus. In the first case examined, although the two notes have an identical lemma, they refer to different celestial constellations (Bootes and Coma), and therefore they are not in contrast with each other. The second and third pair of annotations would appear to show different degrees of paring down and re-adaptation of explanations drawn from the same *hypomnema*; in the fourth case an interlinear gloss, a proper name, coincides with a word of the marginal note, yet without this necessarily implying a different source; in the final case, a phrase of the poem is given two explanations that do not seem to be in opposition with one another but, rather, appear complementary. Only in the second and third pair of *marginalia* can significant redundancies be observed, and they seem to be traceable (definitely in the first case, probably in the second) to the same exegetic source and attributable to the scribe's concrete page layout requirements¹²⁵.

The extensive papyrus fragments known as "Theocritus of Antinoe" (*PAnt. s.n.*; MP³ 1487), found in Antinupolis and first published by Arthur S. Hunt and John Johnson in 1930, come from a Vth or VIth c. codex and contain various compositions of the Theocritean *corpus* accompanied by a rich array of annotations in the four margins and in the interlinear spaces¹²⁶. According to McNamee, signs of exegetic compilation can be perceived in two sets of notes, each of which is attributable to a single hand, albeit with uncertainty as regards a few points.

124 Pfeiffer 1949–1953, I 116. The syntagm $\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ represents the shrewd response of the poet-scholar to the ancient question concerning the genre of the noun $\acute{\alpha}\eta\tau\eta(\varsigma)$ in Homer (see the scholia to *Il.* 15.626): the sense of the second note in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus is to give an implicit reference to this debate as well as the explanation of the Callimachean allusion to the problem.

125 In contrast, McNamee 1995, 409, concludes that «the substantive repetitions of information in these five pairs of notes [our Nos. 1–4 plus the *marginalia* remembered *supra*, n. 122] must mean that they were compiled from at least two sources».

126 Hunt/Johnson 1930, with Pl. II.

1) Theocr. 15, 48 (*The Syracusan Women*) (fol. B6r), notes *a b c* McNamee:

δαλεῖται τὸν ἰόντα παρέρπων Αἰγυπτιστί

a) mg. sn. (int.), beside l. 50

Αἰγυπτιστί:

ἐπ(ει)δ(ή) τῇ[ς] Αἰγύ[π]τ(ου)

ἐστὶν ἡ [Ἀλ]εξάν[δ]ρ(εῖα)

in Egyptian fashion: *because Alexandria is part of Egypt*

b) interl. (ad Αἰγυπτιστί)

ληστρικῶς *like a pirate*

c) mg. inf.

Αἰγυπτισ[τί]: ἄντ(ι τοῦ) ληστρ[ι]κῶς. αὐτοὶ γὰρ

πρῶτον ἐπενόησαν [τὴν ληστείαν]

in Egyptian fashion: *namely, «like a pirate» because they were the ones who invented [piracy]*

There are no formal or content-related elements demonstrating that these three interventions derive from different sources¹²⁷. Their meaning is perfectly compatible, if not indeed complementary, and the interlinear gloss (note *b*) clearly has the same origin as note *c*.

2) Theocr. 15, 63-64 (*The Syracusan Women*) (fol. B6r), notes *a b c d* McNamee:

(Γο.) χρησμῶς ἃ πρεσβῦτις ἀπώχετο θεσπίξασα.

(Πρ.) πάντα γυναικες ἴσαντι, καὶ ὥς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ' Ἥραν

a) mg. sn. (int.), beside l. 63

[[ἀνὴρ τις

θαυμάζει τὴν

ποιήτριαν]]

[a man admires the poetess]

b) mg. sn. (int.), above note a

μία αὐτῶν θαυ-

μάζει τὴν γραῦν

one of the women admires the old woman

127 Likewise McNamee 2007, 85.

c) *mg. dx. (ext.)*, beside l. 63

μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει[ει]

one of the women admires

d) *mg. inf.*

μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει τὴν γραῦν εἰπ(οῦσα)ν ᾗτι(ι) ... α μαντεύματα [< 15]
 ἔτι οὐκ εἶσα τα γα() Τροίας γεγ[< 10] ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες
 π[ο]λλὰ ἴσασι καὶ ταύτην .. η. [< 12] ἴσασι ὅτι π. [< 15]
 [..] ἐαν μετὰ τοῦ .. ρ. [< 25] .. [< 15]
 [....] ... ε ... ορομε[< 30]

one of the women admires the old woman due to the fact of her telling ... prophecies ... not yet ... of Troy ... answered [that women] know many things and this ... they know that ... with the ...

The first line of note *a* is written beside l. 63 of the poem; below the beginning of this l. 63 there is a *paragraphos*, indicating a change of speaker; note *b* is written above note *a*. In McNamee's view, the elements pointing in favour of compilation are the following: 1) redundancy and literal correspondence of notes *b*, *c*, *d*, as well as repetition of the «vernacular expression» μία αὐτῶν (instead of τις αὐτῶν) in these same notes; 2) contradiction between note *a*, which assigns l. 63 to an unidentified Ἀνὴρ, and notes *b*, *c*, *d*, which attribute it to one of the two women (Gorgo or Praxinoa)¹²⁸. These observations can be countered by pointing out that precisely the solecism μία αὐτῶν could be taken to indicate the derivation of the three notes from the same source at the very same moment, rather than from distinct sources or under different circumstances; additionally, the words attributed to the Ἀνὴρ in note *a* should be l. 64¹²⁹ and not l. 63, to which, on the other hand, the other three notes do refer.

The interpretation of the reciprocal relations among these notes must be entirely reconsidered. Annotation *a* is the result of confusion in

128 McNamee 2007, 85. The attribution of cues to speaking characters was one of the traditional fields of intervention by exegetes of plays, see e.g. *sch.* S. *Aj.* 354 Christodoulos: οἷμ' ὡς ξοικας: ὁ χορός ἐστιν ὁ λέγων· οὐ γὰρ εὐπρεπὲς τὴν Τέκμησσαν τὸν λόγον ὑφαρπάζειν λεγόμενον πρὸς τὸν χορόν. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀμφιβολίαις τῶν προσώπων δεῖ τοῦ ἥθους στοχάζεσθαι καὶ διαστέλλειν τὸ πρόσωπον.

129 This is the interpretation in Gow 1952², II 283 (comm. *ad l.*), and Gallavotti 1993³ (who prints in the text the *nota personae* ἈΝΗΡ attested only in this papyrus). In the light of the ancient dialectics of genders, it appears that someone felt the need to attribute to a male voice the *gnome* on the unpredictable abilities of women.

the understanding and recording of a comment that may have been oral, as is suggested by an overall assessment of the contextual data (ll. 59–64 of the poem and the associated *marginalia*):

(...)

ἐκ παιδός. σπεύδομεν· ὄχλος πολὺς ἄμιν ἐπιρρεῖ.

πρὸς γραῦν τινά —

[[ποιήτριαν ἐξ αὐλᾶς, ὦ μᾶτερ; ἐγὼν, τέκνα. εἴτα παρενθεῖν παροιμία

Τελεσίλλαν]

μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει τὴν γραῦν — 61¹³⁰

—

[[ἀνὴρ τις χρησιμῶς ἀπρεσβύτες ἀπώχετο θεσπίσσα. 63 μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει]

θαυμάζει τὴν

ποιήτριαν] πάντα γυναῖκες ἴσαντι, καὶ ὥς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ' Ἥραν.

(...)

μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει τὴν γραῦν εἰπ(οῦσα)ν ὅτι(ι) ... α μαντεύματα [< 15]
 εἴτι οὐκ εἶσα τα να() Τροίας γε[< 10] ἀπεκρίνατ[ο ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες]
 π[ο]λλὰ ἴσασι καὶ ταύτην ..η.[< 12] ἴσασι ὅτι π .[< 15]
 [..] ἐαν μετὰ τοῦ ..ρ.[< 25] ..[< 15]
 [....] ... ε... ορομε[< 30]

On the basis of what seems to emerge from the note [[ποιήτριαν Τελεσίλλαν], written on the left-hand side of l. 60 and then deleted, it is probable that a commentator had individuated an intertextual reference in the passage¹³¹; then, with regard to l. 63, he must have indicated Praxinoa's admiration for the words uttered by the Old Woman, adding that l. 64 is to be attributed to an anonymous Ἀνὴρ interfering in the dialogue. Wrongly merging into one the exegetic observations pertaining to these three points that occur close together, and perhaps also deceived by the omission of l. 62 of the poem in the papyrus, the annotator had written, next to ll. 63–64, that «a man admires the poetess» (which is nonsense, from which one can, however, still indirectly surmise that this is the passage in the poetic text in which Telesilla is alluded to). It can be assumed that the annotator himself, recognizing his mistake, struck out ποιήτριαν Τελεσίλλαν and the note *a* to l. 63 and then wrote note *b* above note *a* as a correction (μία αὐτῶν θαυμάζει

130 The l. 62 καλλίστα παίδων· πείρα θην πάντα τελεῖται, omitted in the text, is added in the right-hand margin, beside l. 61.

131 Telesilla 726 III Page, with comment (Page 1962, 374): «haec omnia ad vv. 61 seqq. referenda, πάντα γυναῖκες ἴσαντι καὶ ὥς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ' Ἥραν: hinc coni. e.p. carmen de Iovis Iunonisque nuptiis composuisse Telesillam: probant Maas *Epid. Hymn.* 141 n. 2, Pfeiffer ad Callim. fr. 48». Cf. Pizzocarò 1993, 101.

τὴν γραῦν)¹³². Furthermore, probably realizing that the explanation of the line continued in a manner he regarded as useful or interesting, he began to (re)write a fuller version (note *c*), though leaving it incomplete and turning to the free part of the lower margin (note *d*). In short, note *a* is a mistake, corrected by the scribe with note *b* of which note *d* is a more extended version; note *c* testifies to the intention of recording the wider comment in the opposite lateral margin, but the intention was immediately abandoned, very likely so as not to invade this space, which was destined preferentially to brief “quick glance” aids¹³³. This reconstructed dynamics, on the one hand, reflects a situation in which the annotator is not copying in a leisurely fashion from a written commentary, but rather is reacting on the spot (and with some difficulty) as he listens to an oral comment; on the other, it highlights that these four interventions had a common origin in the same circumstance from a single and identical exegetic source.

PBingen 18 (MP³ 142.01) is a fragment of a parchment codex from the end of the IVth c., a witness of Aristophanes’ *Knights* accompanied by *marginalia* now somewhat fragmentary¹³⁴. Particularly interesting, on the flesh side, are the three opening lines of annotation, related to ll. 997–998 of the comedy that are not preserved in the fragment (it is the opening of the scene known as “*agon* of the oracles” between Paphlagon and the Sausage-seller: Παφλ. – ἰδοὺ θέασαι, κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω. / Ἄλλαντ. – οἴμ’ ὥς χεσεῖω, κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω), where we find the repetition of the term βάρους:

ὕ]πὸ τοῦ βάρ[ου τῶν βιβλίων τῶν τοῦ
 χρ]ησμῶν ἐχ[όντων χεσεῖω φησί
]ου βάρους τ[

1–2 suppl. Manfredi 3 τ]ου βαρους τ[ων βιβλιων suppl. Manfredi

for the weight [of the books containing the] oracles [he says «I get the stimulus» (l. 998)] ... weight ...

132 This opinion on the origin of note *b* is shared by McNamee 2007, 403 (who rightly believes that the note is incorrectly placed, that is to say, it should refer to l. 63 despite being written beside l. 62); but McNamee then contradicts herself when discussing the question (85: the deleted note is said to be later than the one above it).

133 *Contra* McNamee 2007, 85: the annotation «breaks off at a point probably close to the outer edge of the page and no doubt is virtually complete, for there is enough blank papyrus below the note to fit more information, had the annotator wanted to».

134 *Editio princeps*: Manfredi 2000, with Pl. 10; cf. Montana 2001a. The text reproduced here is that of Montana 2006a, 71 (Aristophanes 9 CLGP).

The remains of ll. 1–2 have very obvious points of contact with the first part of the *sch. Ar. Eq.* 998a¹³⁵, which guides the restoration carried out by Manfredi. In l. 3, despite the aporia of McNamee, who seeks to leave open the possibility of understanding the repetition as an index of compilation from different exegetic sources¹³⁶, the exiguousness of the surviving text (the line is followed below, at some distance, by a different note) would appear to rule out a second redaction of the same note on *χεσεῖω*¹³⁷ or a juxtaposition of comparable notes of different origin. Assistance comes from the *scholium* 997c¹³⁸, which explains the expression *κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω* as well, in its first occurrence uttered by Paphlagon in l. 997, as a reference to the excessive weight of the books. Therefore the three lines must include two notes on distinct parts of l. 998, one concerning *χεσεῖω* (ll. 1–2) and one concerning *κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω* (l. 3); or alternatively, considering the uncertainty of the alignment of the *marginalia* with the corresponding text of the poem, lost in the lacuna, a first note on *κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω* of l. 997 (ll. 1–2 ὑ]πὸ τοῦ βάρ[ους τῶν βιβλίων τῶν τοὺς | χρ]ησμοὺς ἐχ[όντων) and a second pertaining to l. 998 (e.g. ὑπὸ τ]οῦ βάρους τ[ῶν βιβλίων ὁμοίως)¹³⁹.

135 *Sch. Ar. Eq.* 998a (**VEΓΘ**): *χεσεῖω*: ὑπὸ τοῦ βάρους τῶν βιβλίων τῶν τοὺς χρησμοὺς ἐχόντων *χεσεῖω* φησίν. ὥς δὲ ἔνδον καὶ ἄλλων ὄντων χρησμών τὸ οὐχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω φησίν.

136 McNamee 2007, 86, who does not consider Montana 2001a and 2006a, 72.

137 Manfredi 2000, 100, although integrating τ]ου βαρους τ[ων βιβλίων, excludes «una seconda redazione dello stesso scolio».

138 *Sch. Ar. Eq.* 997c (**VEΓ**): λέγει ὅτι τοσοῦτον ἄχθος βασταζῶν ὁμως ἅπαντας ἐξάγειν οὐκ ἐδυνήθη τὸς χρησμούς. καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ὁμοίως τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ.

139 In addition to the cases singled out by McNamee and above reexamined, there are, to my knowledge, another two that need to be taken into account, deriving from exegesis of Aristophanes' comedies. In *PAcad.* inv. 3d + *Bodl. Ms. Gr. class. f.* 72 (P) (Aristophanes 5 CLGP, with Pl. I; cf. Fournet/Gascou 2008, 1061–1066, with Pl. 7–8 at 1060), datable to between the IVth and Vth c., a marginal note to *Eq.* 41 *κυαμοστρώξ* proposes two alternative explanations (*κυάμους*) | ἥσθιον ἰν[α μὴ καθεύδω]σι ἢ ὅτι κυά[μοις ἐχρῶντο] | πολλὰκις .]: the two alternatives are also paired in the medieval scholia 41g and 41i and therefore they must already have appeared as a pair in a *hypomnema* rather than being the result of compilation from different sources by the annotator of the papyrus: cf. Montana 2000, 87–88; 2005, 14–15 n. 60; Fournet/Montana 2006, 52–53. In *BKT IX* 5 (Aristophanes 6 CLGP), a parchment datable to around the end of the Vth c., l. 551 of *Knights* is accompanied by an explanation in the right-hand margin and by another one, written by a different hand and now reduced to just a few letters, in the left-hand margin. Maehler 1968, 292, inclined to exclude two distinct notes concerning the same point of the text. In

Overall, we are unable to document that the annotators of Greek literary papyri dating from the late antiquity and from the proto-Byzantine age genuinely did resort to compilation from different exegetic sources: much less, therefore, can we confirm that this procedure was used with a methodical and systematic criterion.

2.2.4. Paleographic evidence: small capital writings and subscriptions

The existence of small-sized handwriting «is obviously a prerequisite» in order to have dense marginal annotation¹⁴⁰. As mentioned earlier, one of the arguments adduced by Zuntz to deny the late antique origin of scholiography was of an “objective” nature, since it consisted precisely in pointing out the absence of writing of this type prior to the spread of minuscule in the early decades of the IXth c. This assumption began to be undermined first with the 1952 publication of *POxy. XX 2258*, which we have discussed extensively above. Here an Alexandrian majuscule of different sizes is employed for the poetic text and for the *marginalia*, allowing an elevated concentration of the latter¹⁴¹. Other examples of particularly tiny majuscule handwriting utilized for literary and subliterate texts have been detected and viewed in the correct perspective by Wilson and by McNamee; additionally, Guglielmo Cavallo has set the phenomenon in the more general framework of the *manus duplex* (that is to say, the different characteristics, for instance of size, adopted by the scribe to distinguish the text and the comment on the same page)¹⁴². Thus we are now able to align several dozen fragmentary Greek and Latin papyrus or parchment manuscripts, dated to between the Ist and VIIth c., in which the handwriting of the *marginalia* is comparable in size to minuscule script¹⁴³. Therefore, we can rightly state that in late antiquity and the early Byzantine age the scribes’ graphic potential

fact, it is possible that both the notes explain the invocation ἱππὶ ἄναξ Πόσειδον contained in l. 551; but the note on the left, added at a later time, probably had the function of integrating the pre-existing note, perhaps on the basis of the very same *hypomnema* (cf. *sch. Ar. Eq.* 551c). In this case, the Berlin fragment would attest to the subsequent expansion or completion of a previous intervention rather than an episode of compilatory activity of a scholiographic type. Cf. Montana 2001b, 21–22; 2006a, 61, 64–65. For references to images of the concerned side of *BKT IX 5* see *supra*, n. 100.

140 McNamee 2007, 86.

141 Zuntz 1975, 131–133 (*Nachwort*), talks of the Callimachean papyrus as a «Vorstufe» in this respect towards codices containing *corpora* of scholia.

142 Wilson 1977; 1983a, 35; 1984, 107–108; McNamee 1995, 412; Cavallo 2000, 57.

143 Updated overview in McNamee 2007, 86–90.

was in fact compatible with dense annotation in the margins of the manuscripts. Having thereby dispelled what appeared to be a stumbling block to Zuntz, research now faces the remaining task of ascertaining whether *historically* the scribes had the need, opportunity or interest in exploiting that potential for the aim of marginal exegetic compilations.

A second paleographic chapter in the question of the origin of scholiography concerns the subscriptions which, in some medieval manuscripts, list the sources compiled by the scholiasts. They figure, first of all, in the famous ms. *Venetus A* of the *Iliad* (Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 822, olim 454), of the Xth c., at the end of almost all the books of the poem (except Π and Ω)¹⁴⁴; after Aristophanes' *Clouds*, *Birds* and *Peace* in ms. Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 842, olim 474, of the XIth c.¹⁴⁵; in two Euripidean witnesses, the Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2713, of the XIth c. and the Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 765, olim 471, of the XIIth c., after the end of *Orestes*¹⁴⁶ and, in the *Parisinus*, also at the end of *Medea*¹⁴⁷; and, finally, at the end of the *Argonautika* of Apollonius Rhodius in ms. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 32.9, of the Xth c.¹⁴⁸. A common denominator of all these subscriptions is the use of the verbal forms παράκειται or παραγέγραπται to indicate the compilation of the sources: these are forms which, at first glance, one has no hesitation in interpreting as “stands alongside”, “is written in the margins”, with reference to the positioning of the scholiastic *excerpta* around the text of the poem. Guglielmo Cavallo has argued in favour of the late antique origin of these subscriptions and thus also of the related operation of transcribing exegetic material from a variety of separate commentaries into the

144 E.g. fol. 100v (end of H): παράκειται τὰ Ἀριστονίκου σημεῖα καὶ τὰ Διδύμου Περὶ τῆς Ἀριστάρχου διορθώσεως, τινὰ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἰλιακῆς προσωδίας Ἡρωδιανοῦ καὶ Νικάνορος Περὶ στιγμῆς. See for instance Cavallo 2002, Pl. 28 (fol. 282r).

145 Fol. 43r (*Clouds*): κεκώλισται ἐκ τῶν Ἡλιοδώρου, παραγέγραπται δὲ ἐκ τῶν Φαείνου καὶ Συμμάχου καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν (image: Cavallo 2002, Pl. 8). Fol. 122v (*Birds*): παραγέγραπται ἐκ τῶν Συμμάχου καὶ ἄλλων σχολίων. Fol. 146v (*Peace*): κεκώλισται πρὸς τὰ Ἡλιοδώρου, παραγέγραπται ἐκ Φαείνου καὶ Συμμάχου.

146 Fol. 56r of *Parisinus*, fol. 75r of *Marcianus*: πρὸς διάφορα ἀντίγραφα παραγέγραπται ἐκ τοῦ Διονυσίου ὑπομνήματος ὁλοσχερῶς καὶ τῶν μικτῶν.

147 Fol. 129r: πρὸς διάφορα ἀντίγραφα Διονυσίου ὁλοσχερὲς καὶ τινὰ τῶν Διδύμου.

148 Fol. 263v: παράκειται τὰ σχόλια ἐκ τῶν Λουκίλλου Ταρραίου καὶ Σοφοκλείου καὶ Θέωνος. Image: Cavallo 2002, Pl. 5.

margins of codices of literary texts¹⁴⁹. The main points advanced by Cavallo to underpin his view are of an indirect nature: the widespread presence of this kind of subscription in the late antique tradition of Latin authors¹⁵⁰; the tendency of copyists in the middle Byzantine age to passively reproduce colophons of the models; and the presence of a decoration with a rectangular frieze, typical both of the Greek and the Roman area during late antiquity, in some Iliadic subscriptions and in the subscription to the Aristophanean *Clouds* in the two *Marciani* manuscripts which preserve them. However, it is not unwarranted to wonder whether «l'assetto sostanzialmente tardoantico»¹⁵¹ of the subscriptions of the two *Marciani* might not depend on a more generic and purely exterior obedience to formal and decorative modules from the earlier age, with which the Byzantine copyists were familiar¹⁵². And even if it were established that the subscriptions repeated late antiquity colophons, it is worth enquiring into the exact acceptation of the verbs παραγράφεισθαι and παρακεῖσθαι, which are attested in the meaning of “being adapted / related / transcribed / cited”, without reference to the localisation in the text margin or elsewhere¹⁵³.

2.2.5. Separate commentaries on codex from late antiquity

The core of Zuntz's thesis regarding the Byzantine origin of scholiography is the idea that commentaries separate from the literary text, heirs of *hypomnemata* on scroll then transcribed on codices, physically still existed at the dawn of the Macedonian Renaissance and were utilized by the scholiasts to draw up eclectically their marginal comments through compilation. This circumstance, as we have seen, although not rejected, is considered with some scepticism by Wilson, who takes it as his start-

149 Cavallo 1992, 98-104 (= 2002, 181-186); cf. Cavallo 2000, 57-58; Hoffmann 2000, 626 n. 129.

150 Cf. Pecere 1986; Cavallo 1995a.

151 Cavallo 1992, 103.

152 E.g. *ibidem*, 110: *subscriptio* of Alexander of Nicaea, Xth c., in ms. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 90, fol. 305v.

153 Rutherford 1905, 22 n. 23; cf. Lundon 1997, 76. For παραγράφειν in the sense of “imitating”, “drawing on”, “adapting” and also “transcribing from a model”, “referring”, “quoting”, see Montana 2010: particularly interesting Phot. *Bibl.* 273 (507b 17-18 Henry) ὧν (λόγων) ἡμεῖς πέντε τέως εἶδομεν, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τινὰς ἐκλογὰς τὰς ὑποτεταγμένας παρεγραψάμεθα (*excerpta* of the concerned works follow).

ing point to advance the view of an earlier date of the origin of scholiography¹⁵⁴.

Thanks chiefly to the investigations carried out by Herwig Maehler, sufficient documentary evidence has been accumulated to demonstrate that in Graeco-Roman Egypt of IVth–VIIth c. the separate commentary on codex persisted even in the field of profane non-technical-scientific or philosophical literature¹⁵⁵. Although the greater part of the currently known finds do not correspond, in density and quality of the exegesis, to the type we must assume to have served as a source for the scholiasts¹⁵⁶, the very fact of their existence authorizes us to presume that richer and more erudite commentaries may likewise have come into the hands of scholars and copyists of the mid Byzantine age. We are today lucky enough to be able to read at least one (fragmentary) piece of evidence of a more sophisticated hypomnematic work, *POxy. inv. 84/17 (a) + 84/32 (a)*, which testifies to a carefully composed commentary of the *Iliad* on codex written in Alexandrian majuscule dated to the Vth/VIth (Guido Bastianini) or full VIth c. (Daniela Colomo), of which Franco Montanari has published a preview highlighting extremely significant literal contacts with the medieval tradition of the scholia *exegetica* to the Homeric poem¹⁵⁷ (mss. **bT** in Erbse's *stemma codicum*¹⁵⁸).

154 Wilson 1967, 244–245.

155 Maehler 1994, especially 109, 119–121, 124–125; 1998; 2000. In a private conversation in Florence, 13th June 2008, Maehler confirmed to me his conviction that, at the present state of research, Zuntz's thesis is right.

156 Stroppa 2009, 324–325. The type that prevails in the documentation, it would appear, is the highly selective and desultory commentary, which is likely to have taken up only a few pages of codex (cf. *PWürzb.* 1, VIth c., commentary to Euripides' *Phoenician Women*, which also presents aberrant positionings of the lemmata with respect to the tragic text). Such characteristics leave open both that a given codex may have gathered together more than one commentary in sequence (for instance, comments to several plays by the same author or to several books of the same prose work), or else that each text unit contained in the codex (a single play or a single book of a prose work) may have been followed by a selective and succinct explanation, ready for quick use. From a typological point of view, this would be an arrangement comparable to accompanying material, among which the *recueils* of full-page scholia, attested in manuscripts from the medieval and Renaissance era mentioned *supra*, 1.1 with nn. 10–12. A formal precedent of such a set-up could be found in literary scrolls of the imperial age, e.g. *POxy.* VI 856, of the IVth c., commentary to Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (Aristophanes 1 CLGP).

157 Montanari 2009a; cf. Stroppa 2009, No. 9. The full edition of the papyrus is scheduled for *POxy.* LXXVI.

158 Erbse 1969, XLVIII–LII and LVIII (*stemma*).

The known remains of late antique commentaries in codex format have recently been analysed in depth¹⁵⁹. I will thus restrict myself here to mentioning other consonant pieces of evidence, which lead us within and beyond the confines of hellenized Egypt. From the *Suda* (ω 159 Adler) we learn that the Alexandrian grammarian Horapollon, perhaps in the Vth c. («under the reign of Theodosius [II?])», composed ὑπόμνημα (sic) Σοφοκλέους, Ἀλκαίου, εἰς Ὅμηρον; furthermore, as mentioned above, in Alexandria at least up until the Arab conquest, the form of the separate commentary constituted the standard of medical¹⁶⁰, scientific (Eutocius) and philosophical (Simplicius, John Philoponus, Olympiodorus, Elias, Stephanus) enquiry, filtering through to the medieval period mainly via Syriac and Arabic translations. Further information comes again from the *Suda* (ζ 169 Adler), which attributes to «Zosimus of Gaza or Ascalon» who lived «at the time of the emperor Anastasius [I]» (491–518), a ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Δημοσθένην καὶ εἰς Λυσίαν¹⁶¹. In Athens the neoplatonic scholars Syrianus (*Suda* σ 1662 Adler) and Proclus (*Suda* π 2473 Adler) were both authors of commentaries on Homeric poems¹⁶² and Proclus also revised the commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days* composed by Plutarch, which can be reconstructed in part thanks to the medieval scholia¹⁶³. The copy of Syrianus' commentary on the Orphic songs annotated by Proclus with his own *addenda*, mentioned earlier, is an example of how the hypomnematic tradition provided the occasion for exegetic stratification well into the Vth c., and indeed acted as a vehicle for it, yet without in any way affecting the original authorship of the work (especially if the work coincided with a recognized *auctoritas*)¹⁶⁴. To give a final example, Stephanus of Byzan-

159 Stroppa 2009 lists ten fragmentary codices, namely: *PFlor.* II 115 (IIIrd/IVth c.; comm. on Pseudo-Hippocrates' *De alimento*); *PRyl.* III 530 (IIIrd/IVth c.; comm. on Hippocrates' *Aphorisms*); *PVindob.* G 29247 (IIIrd/IVth c.; comm. on Thucydides); *PAmh.* II 20 (IVth c.; comm. on Callimachus' *Hymn* 3); *PAnt.* I 20 (IVth/Vth c.; comm. on Callimachus' *Hymns* 2 and 3); *MPER* N.S. I 25 (IVth/Vth c.; comm. on Demosthenes' *De falsa legatione*); *MPER* N.S. III 20 (Vth c.; comm. on Aristophanes' *Clouds* = Aristophanes 15 CLGP); *MPER* N.S. I 34 (Vth c.; comm. on Aristophanes' *Peace* = Aristophanes 17 CLGP); *POxy.* inv. 84/17 (a) + 84/32 (a) (Vth/VIth c.; comm. on Homer's *Ilias*, to be edited in the *P.Oxy.* series by Franco Montanari); *PWürzb.* 1 (VIth c.; comm. on Euripides' *Phoenician Women*).

160 Cf. Andorlini 2000 and 2003.

161 Cf. Wilson 1967, 255, who infers an active role of Zosimus in the "invention" of scholiography (see *supra*, n. 49).

162 On both see Pontani 2005b, 87.

163 See *supra*, nn. 7 and 90; cf. Wilson 1983a, 39.

164 See *supra*, 2.2.3 with nn. 88–89.

tium seems to provide evidence that a copy of the *hypomnema* of Sophokleios to Apollonius' *Argonautika*, one of the sources cited in the subscription that follows the end of the poem in the ms. Laur. Plut. 32.9, was readily available in Constantinople in the age of Justinian¹⁶⁵.

Thus evidently there existed material and cultural conditions that made it possible for ancient and late antique commentaries on literary works to continue to circulate in Egypt and elsewhere as papyrus or parchment books several centuries after their composition¹⁶⁶, and there is evidence – indeed it is quite plausible – that the situation was not dissimilar in other Greek cities of the Eastern Empire. It can be hypothesized that commentaries of this type also existed in Constantinople or reached the city during the Arab expansion in the first part of the VIIth c., or at the latest after the conquest of Alexandria in 641¹⁶⁷, and that they were utilized in the IXth and Xth c. to draw up commented editions of the classical authors. It would seem highly economical to assume that these commentaries may, in many traditions, have represented what we are still looking for today, namely the missing link in the chain that connects ancient exegesis to the medieval scholia: *hypomnemata* dating from late antiquity, the extreme heirs of the prolonged season of scholarship that began in Ptolemaic Alexandria, still available at a fairly late date as works that were not anonymous but were by recognized authors, and cited as such in the medieval scholiastic subscriptions, although they had in fact been extensively reworked, epitomized or stratified over time, and were conceivably circulating in editions considerably different from one another – according to a destiny that was by no means rare in the field of erudite production¹⁶⁸.

165 Maehler 1994, 108. For the subscription see *supra*, n. 148.

166 As regards the longevity of book scrolls, Galen (*In Hippocratis librum de officina medici commentarii* III, 18/2, 630, 12–15 Kühn) attests to the existence, in his days, of *volumina* πρὸ τριακοσίων ἐτῶν γεγραμμένα.

167 Maehler 1994, 121.

168 This perspective is ignored by Koster 1963, 389–390, theoretically admitted by Wilson 1967, 244–247, accepted by McNamee 1977, 174–175, 180–181, 357–358, 371–372 (but later abandoned by McNamee herself), and excluded by Cavallo 1992, 101, and 2000, 58. This traditional line of development is charted, for example, by Wendel 1920, 167–168, for the making of the *corpus* of scholia to Theocritus; cf. Gow 1952², LXXXI–LXXXII.

3. Resetting the question: from types to texts

The hypothesis of the late antique origin of scholiography, as proposed conjecturally above all by Wilson, has been widely embraced and has exerted considerable influence on scholars of classical antiquity, to the point of being hailed as a definite and certain acquisition. What conclusion emerges from the analysis presented here? That it is wise, I believe, to exercise greater caution with regard to the entire question.

While the investigations conducted by White and Zuntz started out from a specific textual tradition, examined in its historical depth, namely that of the Aristophanean comedies and the associated exegesis, subsequent research has awarded greater priority to a “horizontal” and typological vision of the issue. Important advances in knowledge have thereby achieved, but attention can in a sense be said to have moved away from the concrete specificity of the historical destiny of the texts, thus inevitably introducing an elevated degree of generalization. We have seen that this excessive emphasis on the typological aspects leads to an *impasse*. The *marginalia* attested before the IXth c. display exterior features that are only apparently similar to those of the scholia: even though elements of contact may be perceived which are at times extremely compelling, an underlying lack of homogeneity can be noted between the formal characteristics and the cultural implications of the one and the other type. In the known more ancient codices the notes do not appear to be the fruit of systematic compilation from a variety of sources: if anything, they have generally been added by one or more hands distinct from the hand that wrote out the commented text and they do not correspond to a planned *mise en page* project involving both the text and the comment. Thus, while at times the *marginalia* have the raw materials in common with the scholiastic *corpora*, they differ in extension, complexity and ambition of the overall book-planning scheme, the effort and amount of editorial work involved in drawing and making up the secondary text, and the range (intentional or otherwise) of their cultural impact¹⁶⁹.

To attempt to provide some answers to the question on the genesis of scholiography, then, it will be helpful once again to turn attention to the *individual history* of the texts (independently literary works and related scholia¹⁷⁰), allowing from the very outset the possibility that we may not arrive at a single universally valid answer, but rather a varie-

169 On this point, McNamee 2007, 34 is in agreement.

170 The tradition of a literary work and of the related scholia may have followed different ways: see, for an instance, Smith 1981 (Aeschylus).

gated scenario¹⁷¹: “closed” versus “open” traditions; diversity among antecedents of the individual scholiastic *corpora* (commentaries separate from the literary text still circulating in the early Byzantine age, namely the type we have seen actually documented directly and indirectly; or a single authoritative commentary transferred *in toto* or selectively into the margin of the work being commented upon, of the type perhaps attested by *POxy.* XX 2258; and, as an abstract hypothesis, also *corpuscula* of scholia resulting from systematic compilation of more than one source, a type not documented to date); textual archetypes or ancestors displaying different stages and roles, that is to say, exerting a varying degree of influence in the process of putting together the *corpora* that have come down to us.

A few concrete examples will suffice to show that many of the critical-textual investigations conducted so far concerning the formation of individual medieval *corpora* have come to conclusions that are strikingly divergent from one another¹⁷². In 1971, among the *addenda* to the first volume of his edition of the scholia to the *Iliad*, after taking note of Wilson’s back-dating of the origins of scholiography, Hartmut Erbse stated: «Cui animo prompto paratoque assentiar, dummodo liceat scholia in Iliadem excipere; nam haec nono demum saeculo conglutinata esse inveniuntur, ita quidem in marginibus librorum aetatis Photianae exarata et disposita, ut ex hypomnematibus veteribus profecta esse, non e scholiis marginalibus pendere videantur»¹⁷³. We can assert today that *POxy.* inv. 84/17 (a) + 84/32 (a), the commentary on the *Iliad* of Vth/VIth c. mentioned earlier¹⁷⁴, represents the type of *vetera hypomnemata* believed by Erbse to be the scholiasts’ source, effectively constituting a witness homogeneous with the traditional line of the medieval scholia known as *exegetica*.

As far as the origin of the scholia to Hesiod’s *Works and Days* is concerned, the belief of their editor Agostino Pertusi was that «omnes qui supersunt testes ab uno eodemque fonte aetatis Photii vel Arethae manasse»¹⁷⁵. Ole Langwitz Smith claims that the medieval tradition of the scholia to Aeschylus’ *Oresteia* and *Suppliant Women* can be traced back to

171 The hope that developments will proceed in this direction is expressed by Maehler 1994, 96.

172 The most recent assessment of the modern editions of the *corpora* of scholia to the ancient profane Greek authors is given by Dickey 2007, now to be integrated at least with Cufalo 2007 and Pontani 2007 and 2010, and Xenis 2010.

173 Erbse 1971, 547.

174 Cf. 2.2.5.

175 Pertusi 1955, XXII.

two families μ (known as scholia *Medicea*, since the main representative witness is ms. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 32.9, Xth c.) and ψ (mss. **FET**) and observes: «attamen scholia Medicea vestigia antiquorum commentariorum praebeant quae in recensione codicum **FET** non sunt ... iure enim monuit Ed. Schwartz “quot codices tot recensiones”»; itaque archetypus ex subarchetypis μ et ψ restitui non potest»¹⁷⁶. Criticism on the text of Thucydides has become the battleground of a highly complex debate concerning the closed or open nature of the surviving tradition, and also touching on the formation of the scholiastic *corpus*, which some would place in the IXth c.¹⁷⁷, while others backdate it by several centuries¹⁷⁸. The philosophical component of the scholia to Plato, which is known to be the most ancient, bears a close relation to the commentaries of Olympiodorus preserved in the ms. Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 743, olim 196, copied in the same *scriptorium* as the so-called “philosophical collection”, to which the most ancient manuscripts of the dialogues supplied with scholia belong. Indeed, it is precisely the characteristics of these relations that have induced the most recent editor to consider the scholiastic *corpus* «nel suo complesso come un prodotto bizantino, redatto a partire dal IX secolo e frutto della sedimentazione di almeno tre fasi, l’ultima delle quali databile alla prima metà del X secolo»¹⁷⁹.

A *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* of scholiastic *corpora*, following in the footsteps of Pasquali’s book on literary works, still awaits an author¹⁸⁰. However, one chapter, albeit selective and provisional, on the

176 Smith 1976, XIV; cf. Schwartz 1887, VII.

177 Kleinlogel 1964, especially 235 n. 1; 1965, 143 n. 2; and also 1998, 34–37, 39–40, in response to Luzzatto 1993a (see following n.).

178 Alberti 1972 acknowledges non-archetypal inputs from models in majuscule above all in branch β of the tradition; he therefore defines the Thucydidean *recensio* as “open” (above all XLIII–XLIV, CXLII–CXLIII). Luzzatto 1993a sees elements suggestive of a late antique archetype upstream of the scholia of ms. Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 69.2, and of a large part of branch β of the tradition (one of her arguments resides in the triangular form of some colophones, regarded as a heritage which, in her opinion, far from being archaizing, is substantive and direct coming from a typically late antique model); cf. also Cavallo 1986, 135–136.

179 Cufalo 2007, CVI.

180 Pasquali 1952², especially 185–393 (chapter VI, *Varianti antiche e antiche edizioni*). As far as literary works are concerned, it is useful to bear in mind that in Pasquali’s view (XVIII) «Non vi sono esempi certi di archetipi appartenenti ancora all’antichità per la tradizione greca: non pare che per la tradizione latina tali archetipi possano esser negati»; furthermore, in addition to Greek traditions with a medieval archetype accompanied by ancient variants (Aristophanes,

relation of these *corpora* to the documented textual precedents has been proposed by Maehler, who traces back to common sources (late separate commentaries), and not to editions dating from late antiquity supplied with scholiastic compilations, some astonishing similarities between medieval scholia and *marginalia* of the papyri observed for authors such as Pindar, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius¹⁸¹. For Thucydides, it was already known from Otto Luschnat's research that the exegesis preserved on papyrus testifies to collateral branches as compared to the tradition of medieval scholia and therefore cannot support speculations about a supposed common late antique archetype¹⁸². More recent studies on the exegesis of Demosthenes confirm the absence of connections between what is currently restored by the Graeco-Egyptian papyri and the scholia¹⁸³. And some convergences between the notes of fragmentary codices of Aristophanes' comedies dating from the IVth and Vth centuries and the corresponding medieval scholia, striking though they may be, do not warrant doubts as to the reciprocal autonomy of the witnesses, being rather imputable to common hypomnematic sources independently drawn on by

Euripides), Pasquali reconstructed medieval traditions without an archetype, which wholly or partly carry on ancient editions (Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Herodotus, Thucydides). *Contra* Hunger 1961 was thinking of generally closed recensions that can be traced back to archetypes dating from no later than the IXth c. (especially 213: «Der Schöpfer eines mittelalterlichen Archetypus war in der Regel nicht ein mechanisch arbeitender Schreiber, sondern ein philologisch interessierter Herausgeber. Die Zusammensetzung der Scholiencorpora gestattet den sichern Schluß, die Textgestalt vieler Archetypi die wahrscheinliche Vermutung, daß die Gelehrten des 9. Jh. mit mehreren antiken Exemplaren arbeiteten, um eine neue, fortan maßgebende Ausgabe zu konstituieren. Nur seltenen Schriften, von denen sich lediglich ein einziges Exemplar hatte finden lassen, wurden unverändert in die neue Schriftart transkribiert»).

181 Maehler 1994; cf. Papathomas 2003, 281–283. The casual nature and the sectorial localization of papyrus discoveries may understandably lead to a sceptical outlook with regard to the feasibility of placing *marginalia* and scholia within the same traditional framework. Nevertheless, their relationship inescapably has to be assessed in concrete terms, because the papyrus fragments are not always preserved in a state or size that make it possible to definitively rule out the eventuality that they may belong to copies with annotation typologically comparable or textually relatable to that of the Byzantine scholia; and, ultimately, because this assessment is among the institutional and ineludable duties of the philology and history of textual tradition.

182 Luschnat 1954, 25–31; cf. Papathomas 2003, 283.

183 Lossau 1964; Gibson 2002. A faint correspondence with medieval scholia is provided by the commentary *MPER* N.S. I 25r, l. 5 (Gibson 2002, 74 n. 2).

scribes and scholiasts¹⁸⁴. We may envisage that the collection of exegetic *marginalia* recently edited by McNamee¹⁸⁵ and the systematic (re)publication of the documentation, launched with the *CLGP* project¹⁸⁶, will encourage both a fresh examination of the individual traditions as well as more reliable and more solidly founded overall evaluations. The greatest possible attention should be devoted, in this perspective, to any future discoveries of literary papyri that bear witness to exegesis.

The rich and variegated mosaic of schools and institutions that were active during late antiquity in the main centres of the Eastern Empire, which is gradually being recomposed in its vibrant dynamism and its uninterrupted dialogue with the earlier culture, included experiences of the production, use and circulation of manuscript copies that simultaneously acted as a vehicle for exegesis designed to fulfil various goals at different levels. However, our knowledge on the codicological and editorial aspects of these experiences is only partial, arbitrarily or accidentally selective, and episodic. The well-known gap in documentation on book production becomes more severe for the period from the VIth to the VIIIth c. and hampers not only an assessment of the persistence of this cultural and material heritage in the areas that had fallen under Arab dominion and within the confines of the Empire during the so-called “Dark Ages”, but also any appreciation of their impact, in the subsequent era, on the choices favoured by Byzantine erudites. In the current silence of the documentation and given the fragmentary nature of available knowledge, it seems hazardous to endorse the idea that (one of) these areas played a key role in the “invention” of scholiography as we see it realized in the medieval manuscripts.

In this picture, which calls for a reconstructive and conjectural approach, the considerations put forward by Paul Lemerle on the introduction of minuscule in the VIIIth-IXth c., as an innovation prompted

184 Montana 2006c, 21–26. One can add examples from the “technical disciplines” such as law and medicine, with regard to which Andorlini 2000, 44, recognizes that in annotated late antique codices it is «la costante sproporzione tra lo spazio modesto degli ‘apparati’ e l’estensione a piena pagina del ‘testo primario’, il dato che fa la differenza rispetto alla equilibrata compresenza di testo e commento che caratterizzerà la nuova impostazione grafica del codice medievale».

185 McNamee 2007, 129–512.

186 Guido Bastianini / Michael Haslam / Herwig Maehler / Franco Montanari / Cornelia Römer (eds.), *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta*; to date, the following issues have appeared: I. *Commentaria et lexica in auctores*, 1.1. *Aeschines-Alcaeus* and 1.4. *Aristophanes-Bacchylides*; II. *Commentaria in adespotata*, 4. *Comoedia et mimus*.

by a new cultural need, still remain extremely illuminating from the methodological point of view: «cela ne se conçoit guère si des besoins particulièrement pressants de communication et de diffusion de la pensée n'avaient alors poussé à innover. Car il ne s'agit pas, au point de départ, d'une découverte plus ou moins fortuite, entraînant à l'improviste des progrès irréalisables sans elle: c'est au contraire l'existence d'un besoin qui a provoqué "l'invention". Le IX^e siècle est l'une des époques les plus originales et novatrices de l'histoire de Byzance, ou plutôt, il est l'aboutissement d'une longue et profonde évolution, commencée bien avant, au lendemain de la conquête arabe, et par laquelle Byzance se transforma pour survivre. (...) il peut justement paraître surprenant qu'on ait dû attendre si longtemps, pour que se produise un changement somme toute aussi simple dans ses moyens, et aussi vaste dans ses conséquences. Ne pouvait-on s'aviser plus tôt des avantages d'une écriture plus simple que l'onziale? Si on ne le fit pas, cela confirme que dans l'époque antérieure l'édition était peu active, et les besoins en livre réduits»¹⁸⁷ – or at least different. By the same token, in the absence of direct evidence, the existence of scholiography cannot be postulated as a need or an obvious historical fact for the era prior to the IXth c.

We can legitimately demand positive, more circumstantial and more cogent proof than has been adduced so far for setting back to late antiquity the shift from marginal explanatory annotation to systematic compilation of earlier exegesis in the framework of an overall book production project – which would strip of this founding role the copyists and scholars of the IXth and Xth c., to whom we owe the surviving tradition of the ancient authors and the related scholiastic *corpora* so far¹⁸⁸. Given the lack of concrete evidence¹⁸⁹, *argumenta e silentio* and other controvertible or inconclusive lines of reasoning ultimately prove to be unsatisfactory.

187 Lemerle 1971, 120-121.

188 The opinion of Cavallo 1992, 104, for instance, is that «a partire dall'età macedone, non vi furono rilevanti contributi originali dei dotti bizantini alla formazione delle raccolte scoliastiche, limitandosi questi ad interventi accessori con la sovrapposizione di ulteriori materiali agli antichi». For the general problem of IXth and Xth c. Byzantine scholarship, the reader is referred to Lemerle 1971; Wilson 1983a, 79-147; Alpers 1991; Reynolds-Wilson 1991³, 58-65; Cavallo 1995b, 277-289 (= 2002, 206-218).

189 In the very words of McNamee 2007, 91. Cf. Wilson 1983a, 34: «There are, however, several reasons for thinking that the old view which attributed the compilation of scholia to late antiquity was correct, and *although none of them is decisive*, collectively they make a strong case» (my emphasis). Cavallo 2000, 57, speaks of «motivazioni indirette».

Bibliography

- Abbamonte, Giancarlo (2004), „Tipologie esegetiche nei commenti di Alessandro di Afrodisia: la parafrasi“, in: Giancarlo Abbamonte / Ferruccio Conti Bizzarro / Luigi Spina (eds.), *L'ultima parola. L'analisi dei testi: teorie e pratiche nell'antichità greca e latina*. Atti del terzo Colloquio italo-francese coordinato da Luigi Spina e Laurent Pernot, Napoli 13-15 marzo 2003, Napoli, 19-34.
- Adams, Charles D. (ed.) (1919), *The Speeches of Aeschines*, with an English translation, London-New York.
- Alberti, Giovan Battista (ed.) (1972), *Thucydides Historiae*, I, *Libri I-II*, Roma.
- Allen, Thomas W. (1931), „The Homeric scholia“, in: *Proceedings of the British Academy* 17, 179-207 (as abstract: London 1931).
- Alpers, Klaus (1991), „Eine byzantinische Enzyklopädie des 9. Jahrhunderts“, in: Guglielmo Cavallo / Giuseppe De Gregorio / Marilena Maniaci (eds.), *Scritture, libri e testi nelle aree provinciali di Bisanzio*. Atti del Seminario di Erice (18-25 settembre 1988), Spoleto, I 235-269.
- Andò, Valeria (2005), *L'ape che tesse. Saperi femminili nella Grecia antica*, Roma.
- Andorlini, Isabella (2000), „Codici papiracei di medicina con scoli e commento“ in: Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*. Actes du colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles (Paris et Villejuif, 22-25 septembre 1999), Paris, 37-52 (Pl. 1-7).
- (2003), „L'esegesi del libro tecnico: papiri di medicina con scoli e commenti“, in: *Papiri filosofici. Miscellanea di studi*, IV, Firenze, 9-29 (Pl. I-VII).
- Arata, Luigi / Bastianini, Guido / Montanari, Franco (eds.) (2004), „Aeschylus 3. P.Oxy. XX 2256. Hypotheseis di varie tragedie“, in: CLGP I.1.4 (Aristophanes-Bacchylides), 34-51.
- Arens, Hans (2000), „Sprache und Denken bei Aristoteles“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*, I, 1, 1, Berlin-New York, 367-375.
- Ascheri, Paola (2009), „Demetrius [5]“, in: LGGA.

- (2010), „Aristodemus [3]“, in: LGGA.
- Ax, Wolfram (1982), „Aristarch und die “Grammatik”“, in: *Glotta* 60, 96–109 (reprinted in: Ax 2000, 128–139).
- (1986), *Laut, Stimme und Sprache. Studien zu drei Grundbegriffen der antiken Sprachtheorie*, Göttingen.
- (1987), „Quadripertita ratio: Bemerkungen zur Geschichte eines aktuellen Kategoriensystems (*Adiectio, Detractio, Transmutatio, Immutatio*)“, in: Daniel J. Taylor (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 17–40 (reprinted in: Ax 2000, 190–208).
- (1990), „Aristophanes von Byzanz als Analogist. Zu Fragment 374 Slater (= Varro, *de lingua Latina* 9, 12)“, in: *Glotta* 68, 4–18 (reprinted in: Ax 2000, 116–127).
- (1991), „Sprache als Gegenstand der alexandrinischen und pergamenischen Philologie“, in: Schmitter 1991, 275–301 (reprinted in: Ax 2000, 95–115).
- (1993), „Der Einfluss des Peripatos auf die Sprachtheorie der Stoa“, in: Klaus Döring / Theodor Ebert (eds.), *Dialektiker und Stoiker. Zur Logik der Stoa und ihre Vorläufer*, Stuttgart, 11–32 (reprinted in: Ax 2000, 73–94).
- (2000), *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*, hrsg. von Farouk Grewing, Stuttgart.
- Baladié, Raoul (1980), *Le Péloponnèse de Strabon. Étude de géographie historique*, Paris.
- Baltussen, Han (2008), *Philosophy and Exegesis in Simplicius. The Methodology of a Commentator*, London.
- Barker, Edmund H. (ed.) (1820), *Arkadiou peri tonon, e codicibus Parisinis. Addita est editoris epistola critica ad J. F. Boissonade*, Leipzig.
- Barwick, Karl (1922), *Remmius Palaemon und die römische Ars grammatica*, Leipzig.
- (1957), *Probleme der stoischen Sprachlehre und Rhetorik*, Berlin.
- Bastianini, Guido (2001), „Osservazioni sul papiro di Teramene“, in: *Ποίκιλα*. Studi in onore di Michele R. Cataudella, La Spezia, 81–87.
- Bastianini, Guido / Gallazzi, Claudio (eds.) (2001), *Papiri dell'Università degli Studi di Milano, VIII, Posidippo di Pella. Epigrammi (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*, con la collaborazione di Colin Austin, Milano.
- Bastianini, Guido / Lundon, John (2000), „Coniugazioni verbali e *scholia minora* in un polittico scolastico“, in: H. Melaerts (ed.), *Papyri in honorem Iohannis Bingen octogenarii*, Leuven, 31–42 (Pl. 4).
- Bastianini, Guido / Sedley, David N. (eds.) (1995), „Commentarium in Platonis «Theaetetus»“, in: CPF III, Firenze, 227–562.
- Bayet, Jean (1920), „Les origines de l'arcadisme romain“, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École Française de Rome* 38, 63–143.
- Bécares Botas, Vicente (ed.) (1987), *Apolonio Díscolo, Sintaxis*, introducción, traducción y notas, Madrid.

- Bednarski, Michał (ed.) (2000), *Apollonios Dyskolos, O składni*, Kraków.
- Berndt, Richard (1902), *De Charete, Chaeride, Alexione grammaticis eorumque reliquiis*, I, *Charetis Chaeridisque fragmenta quae supersunt*, Königsberg.
- Bickerman, Elias J. (1952), „Origines gentium“, in: *Classical Philology* 47, 65–81.
- Blank, David L. (1982), *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar. The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, Chico, CA.
- (1994), „Analogy, Anomaly and Apollonius Dyscolus“, in: Stephen Everson (ed.), *Language*, Cambridge, 149–165.
- (ed.) (1998), *Sextus Empiricus, Against the Grammarians (Adversus mathematicos I)*, translated with an introduction and commentary, Oxford.
- (2000), „The Organization of Grammar in Ancient Greece“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*, I, 1, 1, Berlin-New York, 400–417.
- (2005), „Varro's Anti-analogist“, in: Frede/Inwood 2005, 210–238.
- Blass, Friedrich (ed.) (1908²), *Aeschines, Orations*, Leipzig (1st ed. 1896).
- Blass, Friedrich / Schindel, Ulrich (eds.) (1978), *Aeschinis Orations*, Stuttgart.
- Blau, August (1883), *De Aristarchi discipulis. Dissertatio philologica*, Jena.
- Boudreaux, Pierre (1919), *Le texte d'Aristophanes et ses commentateurs*, Paris.
- Brandenburg, Philipp (ed.) (2005), *Apollonios Dyskolos, Über das Pronomen, Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterung*, München-Leipzig.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl (2002), *The grammarian Epaphroditus*, in: ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΙΑ΄ ΔΙΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΚΛΑΣΣΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ. ΚΑΒΑΛΑ 29–30 ΑΥΓΟΥΣΤΟΥ 1999, Athina, II 161–171.
- Braswell, Bruce Karl / Billerbeck, Margarethe (eds.) (2008), *The Grammarian Epaphroditus. Testimonia and Fragments*, edited and translated with an introduction, notes and commentary, with the collaboration of Simonetta Marchitelli / Orlando Poltera / Christian Zubler, Bern.
- Bravo, Benedetto (2006), „Felix Jacoby, Arnaldo Momigliano e l'erudizione antica“, in: Carmine Ampolo (ed.), *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa, 227–257.
- Briquel, Dominique (1984), *Les Pélasges en Italie. Recherches sur l'histoire de la légende*, Roma.
- Brocquet, Sylvain (2005), „Apollonius Dyscole et l'adverbe“, in: *Histoire, épistémologie, langage* 27/2, 121–140.
- Broggiato, Maria (ed.) (2001), *Cratete di Mallo, I frammenti*, edizione, introduzione e note, La Spezia (then: Roma 2006).

- Buttmann, Alexander (ed.) (1877), *Des Apollonios Dyskolos vier Bücher über die Syntax*, überstetzt und erläutert, Berlin.
- Cadoni, Nicola (2010), „Aristotele e l'omeristica antica: sondaggi su ῥήθεις“, in: Fausto Montana (ed.), *Aner Polytropos*. Ricerche di filologia greca antica dedicate dagli allievi a Franco Montanari, Roma, 3-39.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (1962), *La tendenza grammaticale dell'Auctor ad Herennium*, in: Id., *Studi grammaticali*, Bologna, 139-242.
- Callanan, Christopher K. (1987), *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz*, Göttingen.
- Canfora, Luciano (1995), „Le collezioni superstiti“, in: Giuseppe Cambiano / Luciano Canfora / Diego Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo* (II, *L'Ellenismo*), Roma, 95-250.
- Cassio, Albio Cesare (1993), „Parlate locali, dialetti delle stirpi e fonti letterarie nei grammatici greci“, in: Emilio Crespo / José Luis García Ramón / Rosa Araceli Striano (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca*. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega (Miraflores de la Sierra [Madrid], 19-21 de junio de 1991), Madrid, 73-90.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo (1980), „La trasmissione scritta della cultura greca antica in Calabria e in Sicilia tra i secoli X-XV. Consistenza, tipologia, fruizione“, in: *Scrittura e civiltà* 4, 157-245.
- (1986), „Conservazione e perdita dei testi greci: fattori materiali, sociali, culturali“, in: Andrea Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, IV, *Tradizione dei classici. Trasformazioni della cultura*, Roma-Bari, 83-172, 246-271 (reprinted in: Cavallo 2002, 49-175).
- (1992), „La storia dei testi antichi a Bisanzio. Qualche riflessione“, in: Jacqueline Hamesse (ed.), *Les problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes anciens et médiévaux*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 95-111 (partially reprinted in: Cavallo 2002, 177-186).
- (1995a), „Qualche annotazione sulla trasmissione dei classici nella tarda antichità“, in: *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 125, 205-219 (reprinted in: Cavallo 2002, 31-47).
- (1995b), „I fondamenti culturali della trasmissione dei testi a Bisanzio“, in: Giuseppe Cambiano / Luciano Canfora / Diego Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, II, *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma, 265-306 (reprinted in: Cavallo 2002, 195-233).
- (2000), „Una mano e due pratiche. Scrittura del testo e scrittura del commento nel libro greco“, in: Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*. Actes du colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles (Paris et Villejuif, 22-25 septembre 1999), Paris, 55-64.
- (2002), *Dalla parte del libro. Storie di trasmissione dei classici*, Urbino.

- Cavallo, Guglielmo / Maehler, Herwig (1987), *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: A.D. 300-800*, London.
- Chantraine, Pierre (1968-1980), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, I-IV, Paris.
- Chiabà, Monica (2003), „Trosia P. Hermonis L. Hilara, lanifica circlatrix (InscrAq. 69)“, in: Alfredo Buonopane / Francesca Cenerini (eds.), *Donna e lavoro nella documentazione epigrafica*. Atti del I Seminario sulla condizione femminile nella documentazione epigrafica, Bologna, 21 novembre 2002, Faenza, 261-276.
- Chiesa, Paolo (2002), *Elementi di critica testuale*, Bologna.
- Christes, Johannes (1979), *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden.
- Christodoulos, Georgios A. (ed.) (1977), *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους. Κριτική ἔκδοσις*, Athina.
- Classen, Johannes (1829), *De grammaticae Graecae primordiis*, Bonn.
- CLGP = Bastianini, Guido / Haslam, Michael / Maehler, Herwig / Montanari, Franco / Römer, Cornelia (eds.), *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris reperta (CLGP)*, München-Leipzig, 2004-.
- Cohn, Leopold (1901), „Demetrios (n. 102)“, in: RE 4/2, 2847.
- (1905), „Epaphroditos (n. 5)“, in: RE 5/2, 2711-2714.
- Collart, Jean (1954), *Varron, grammairien latin*, Paris.
- Colomo, Daniela (2008), „Osservazioni sullo scriba ossirinchita dell'omega quadrangolare (Johnson A2)“, in: *Segno e testo* 6, 3-34.
- Colson, Francis H. (1919), „The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy“, in: *The Classical Quarterly* 13, 24-36.
- Condello, Emma (2002), „Ai margini di Virgilio. Paleografia e codicologia degli *Scholia Veronensia*“, in: Vincenzo Fera / Giacomo Ferraù / Silvia Rizzo (eds.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 26 September-3 October 1998, as the 12th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records, Messina, 59-80.
- CPF = *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici greci e latini (CPF)*. *Testi e lessico nei papiri di cultura greca e latina*, I.1★ Firenze 1989; I.1★★ Firenze 1992; I.1★★★ Firenze 1999; III Firenze 1995; IV Firenze 2002.
- Criboire, Raffaella (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton.
- Cufalo, Domenico (ed.) (2007), *Scholia Graeca in Platonem*, I, *Scholia ad dialogos tetralogiarum I-VII continens*, Roma.
- Dahlmann, Hellfried (1935), „Terentius (n. 84)“, in: RE Suppl. 4, 1172-1277.
- Daintree, David / Geymonat, Mario (1988), „Scholia non Serviana“, in: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, IV, Roma, 706-720.

- Dalimier, Catherine (1991), „Sextus Empiricus contre les grammairiens: ce que parler grec veut dire“, in: Suzanne Saïd (ed.), *Ἑλληνισμός: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25-27 octobre 1989, Leiden, 17-32.
- (ed.) (2001), *Apollonius Dyscole, Traité de conjonctions*, introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire, Paris.
- De Gregorio, Giuseppe (2000), „Materiali vecchi e nuovi per uno studio della minuscola greca tra VII e IX secolo“, in: Giancarlo Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito*. Atti del V Colloquio internazionale di paleografia greca, Cremona, 4-10 ottobre 1998, Firenze, 83-151.
- Delcourt, Anouk (2005), *Lecture des Antiquités romaines de Denys d'Halicarnasse. Un historien entre deux mondes*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Depew, Mary / Obbink, Dirk (eds.) (2000), *Matrices of Genre. Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge, Mass.-London.
- Devreesse, Robert (1928), „Chaînes exégétiques grecques“, in: *Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément I*, Paris, 1084-1233.
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo (1958-1959), „Dionisio Trace e la *Techne* a lui attribuita“, in: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Classe di Lettere e Filosofia)* 27, 169-210; *ibid.* 28, 87-118 (reprinted in: Di Benedetto 2007, II 381-461).
- (1966), „Demetrio Cloro e Aristone di Alessandria“, in: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Classe di Lettere e Filosofia)* 35, 321-324 (reprinted in: Di Benedetto 2007, II 463-468).
- (1973), „La *Techne* spuria“, in: *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa (Classe di Lettere e Filosofia)* 3, 797-814 (reprinted in: Di Benedetto 2007, II 469-484).
- (1990), „At the Origins of Greek Grammar“, in: *Glotta* 68, 19-39 (reprinted in: Di Benedetto 2007, II 485-503).
- (1998), „Afterword“, in: Vivien Law / Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the *Techne* grammatikē*, Münster, 151-153.
- (2000), „Dionysius Thrax and the *Tékhne grammatikē*“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*, I, 1, 1, Berlin-New York, 394-400 (reprinted in: Di Benedetto 2007, II 521-531).
- (2007), *Il richiamo del testo: contributi di filologia e letteratura*, I-IV, Pisa.
- Di Gregorio, Lamberto (1974), „Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli *scholia vetera* alla *Teogonia* di Esiodo, IV, Conclusioni“, in: *Aevum* 46, 1-15.
- (ed.) (1975), *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam*, Milano 1975.

- Dickey, Eleanor (2007), *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford-New York.
- Dihle, Albrecht (1959), „Ptolemaios (n. 70)“, in: RE 23/2, 1860–1861.
- Dilts, Mervin R. (ed.) (1997), *Aeschinis Orationes*, Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- Donini, Pierluigi (1994), „Testi e commenti, manuali e insegnamento: la forma sistematica e i metodi della filosofia in età postellenistica“, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* 36/7, 5027–5100.
- Donnet, Daniel (1967), „La place de la syntaxe dans les traités de grammaire grecque, des origines au XII siècle“, in: *L'antiquité classique* 36, 22–48.
- Dorival, Gilles (1984), „Des commentaires de l'Écriture aux chaînes“, in: *Bible de tous les temps*, I, Paris, 361–383.
- (1986), *Les chaînes exégétiques grecques sur les Psaumes: contribution à l'étude d'une forme littéraire*, I, Leuven.
- Dover, Kenneth (ed.) (1993), *Aristophanes, Frogs*, Oxford.
- Dubuisson, Michel (1984), „Le latin est-il une langue barbare?“, in: *Ktèma* 9, 55–68.
- (1987), „Homérologie et politique. Le cas d'Aristodémos de Nysa“, in: Jean Servais / Tony Hackens / Brigitte Servais-Soyez (eds.), *Stemmata. Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et d'archéologie grecques offerts à Jules Labarbe*, Liège – Louvain-la-Neuve, 1987, 15–24.
- Duè, Casey (ed.) (2009), *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy. Images and Insights from the Venetus A Manuscript of the Iliad*, Washington, DC.
- Eberline, Charles N. (1980), *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Ranae of Aristophanes*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Egger, Émile (1854), *Apollonius Dyscole. Essai sur l'histoire des théories grammaticales dans l'Antiquité*, Paris.
- Erbse, Hartmut (1960), *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*, München.
- (1965), „Scholien“, in: Carl Andresen et al. (eds.), *Lexikon der alten Welt*, Zürich-Stuttgart, 2723–2725.
- (ed.) (1969), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, I, Berlin.
- (ed.) (1971), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, II, Berlin.
- (1980), „Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandriner“, in: *Glotta* 58, 236–258.
- Ernst, Nicola (ed.) (2006), *Die D-Scholien zur Odyssee. Kritische Ausgabe*, Köln (digital edition: <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/volltexte/2006/1831/>).
- Esposito, Elena (ed.) (2004), „Aeschines“, in: CLGP I.1.1 (Aeschines–Alcaeus), München-Leipzig, 3–11.
- Faraggiana di Sarzana, Chiara (1978), „Il commentario procliano alle Opere e i giorni, I, Plutarco fonte di Proclo“, in: *Aevum* 52, 17–40.

- (1981), „Il commentario procliano alle *Opere e i giorni*, II, Destinazione e fortuna dell'opera nella Scuola d'Atene e dopo la sua chiusura“, in: *Aevum* 55, 22-29.
- (1987), „Le commentaire à Hésiode et la *paideia* encyclopédique de Proclus“, in: Pépin/Saffrey 1987, 21-41.
- Fehling, Detlev (1956-1957), „Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion“, in *Glotta* 35, 214-270; *ibid.*, 36, 48-100.
- (1979), review of Siebenborn 1976, in: *Gnomon* 51, 488-490.
- Fernández-Galiano, Manuel / Heubeck, Alfred (eds.) (1993⁴), *Omero, Odissea*, VI, *Libri XXI-XXIV*, trad. di Giuseppe Aurelio Privitera, Milano (1st ed. 1986).
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis (1988), *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédonie à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Roma.
- Fournet, Jean-Luc / Gascou, Jean (2008), „Un lot d'archives inédit de Lycopolis (Égypte) à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres“, in: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 1041-1074.
- Fournet, Jean-Luc / Montana, Fausto (eds.) (2006), „*P.Acad. inv. 3d + Bodl. Ms. Gr. class. f. 72 (P)*“, in: CLGP I.1.4 (Aristophanes-Bacchylides), 48-56.
- Fraser, Peter M. (1972), *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I-III, Oxford.
- Frede, Dorothea / Inwood, Brad (eds.) (2005), *Language and Learning. Philosophy of Language in the Hellenistic Age*. Proceedings of the Ninth Symposium Hellenisticum, Cambridge-New York.
- Frede, Michael (1977), „The Origins of Traditional Grammar“, in: Robert E. Butts / Jaakko Hintikka (eds.), *Historical and Philosophical Dimensions of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*. Part four of the Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science, London, Ontario, Canada 1975, Dordrecht-Boston, 51-79.
- (1978), „Principles of Stoic Grammar“, in: John M. Rist (ed.), *The Stoics*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 27-75.
- Friedländer, Ludwig (ed.) (1853), *Aristonici Περὶ σημείων Ἰλιάδος reliquiae emendatiores*, Göttingen.
- Führer, Rudolf / Schmidt, Martin (2001), „Homerus redivivus“, in: *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 253, 1-32.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred (1960), *Das systematische Lehrbuch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike*, Göttingen.
- Funaioli, Gino (ed.) (1907), *Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- (1930), *Esegesi virgiliana antica. Prolegomeni alla edizione del commento di Giunio Filargiro e di Tito Gallo*, Milano.
- Gabba, Emilio (1963), „Il latino come dialetto greco“, in: *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, Torino, 188-194.

- (1974), „Storiografia greca e imperialismo romano (III-I sec. a.C.)“, in: *Rivista storica italiana* 86, 625-642.
- (1976), „Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origini troiane di Roma fra III e II secolo a.C.“, in: Marta Sordi (ed.), *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*, Milano, 84-101.
- (1982), „La ‘Storia di Roma arcaica’ di Dionigi d’Alicarnasso“, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 30/1, 799-816.
- Gallavotti, Carlo (ed.) (1993³), *Theocritus quique feruntur bucolici Graeci*, Roma (Ist ed. 1946).
- Gammacurta, Tatiana (2006), *Papyrologica scaenica. Copioni teatrali nella tradizione papiracea*, Alessandria.
- Geerard, Maurits (1980), *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, IV, *Concilia – Catenae*, Turnhout.
- Gerstinger, Hans (1970), *Dioscurides. Codex Vindobonensis Med. Gr. 1 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*. Kommentarband zu der Facsimileausgabe, Graz.
- Geymonat, Mario (1985), „Filargirio“, in: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, II, Roma, 520-521.
- GG = *Grammatici Graeci*, I-IV, Leipzig 1867-1901.
- Gibson, Craig A. (2002), *Interpreting a Classic. Demosthenes and His Ancient Commentators*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- Giomini, Remo (1953), „Il grammatico Filosseno e la derivazione del latino dall’eolico“, in: *La parola del passato* 8, 365-376.
- Glock, Andreas (2001), „Scholien“, in: NP 11, 209-214.
- Goetz, Georg (1896), „Ateius (n. 11)“, in: RE 2/2, 1910-1911.
- (1900), „Cloatius (n. 2)“, in: RE 4/1, 61-62.
- Golitsis, Pantelis (2008), *Les commentaires de Simplicius et de Jean Philopon à la “Physique” d’Aristote: tradition et innovation*, Berlin-New York.
- Gow, Andrew S. F. (ed.) (1952²), *Theocritus*, I-II, Cambridge (Ist ed. 1950).
- Grenfell, Bernard P. / Hunt, Arthur S. (eds.) (1915), „P.Oxy. 1371“, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XI, London.
- Gudeman, Alfred (1912), „Grammatik“, in: RE 7/2, 1780-1811.
- (1921), „Scholien“, in: RE 2A/1, 625-705.

- Haas, Walter (ed.) (1977), *Die Fragmente der Grammatiker Tyrannion und Diokles*, (SGLG 3), Berlin-New York.
- Hagen, Hermann (ed.) (1902), „Appendix Serviana. Ceteros praeter Servium et Scholia Bernensia Vergilii commentatores continens“, in: Georg Thilo / Hermann Hagen (eds.), *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, III/2, Leipzig.
- Haslam, Michael W. (ed.) (1986), „POxy. 3710“, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part LIII, London, 89-112.

- Hatch, William H. P. (1937), „A Redating of Two Important Uncial Manuscripts of the Gospel. Codex Zacynthius and Codex Cyprius“, in: Robert P. Casey / Silva Lake / Agnes K. Lake (eds.), *Quantulacumque*. Studies presented to Kirsopp Lake, London, 333–338.
- Hennigfeld, Jochem (1994), *Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie. Antike und Mittelalter*, Berlin–New York.
- Hertz, Martin J. (ed.) (1855–1859), *Grammatici Latini*, II/III, *Prisciani grammatici Caesariensis Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII*, Leipzig.
- Hilgard, Alfred (ed.) (1901), *Grammatici Graeci*, I/II, *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*, Leipzig.
- Hill, Herbert (1961), „Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Origins of Rome“, in: *The Journal of Roman Studies* 61, 88–93.
- Hillscher, Alfred (1892), „Hominum litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum historia critica“, in: *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Suppl.* 18, 355–440.
- Hoekstra, Arie (ed.) (1993^a), *Omero, Odissea, IV, Libri XIII–XVI*, trad. di Giuseppe Aurelio Privitera, Milano (1st ed. 1984).
- Hoffmann, Philippe (2000), „Bibliothèques et formes du livre à la fin de l'antiquité. Le témoignage de la littérature néoplatonicienne des V^e et VI^e siècles“, in: Giancarlo Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito*. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia Greca (Cremona, 4–10 ottobre 1998), Firenze, II 601–632.
- Holtz, Louis (1984), „Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires“, in: Cesare Questa / Renato Raffaelli (eds.), *Il libro e il testo*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Urbino, 20–23 settembre 1982, Urbino, 141–167.
- (1995), „Glosse e commenti“, in: Guglielmo Cavallo / Claudio Leonardi / Enrico Menestò (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, I, *Il Medioevo latino* (III, *La ricezione del testo*), Roma, 59–111.
- (2000), „Le rôle des commentaires d'auteurs classiques dans l'émergence d'une mise en page associant texte et commentaire (Moyen Âge occidental)“, in: Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*. Actes du colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles (Paris et Villejuif, 22–25 septembre 1999), Paris, 101–117.
- Householder, Fred W. (ed.) (1981), *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, translated and with commentary, Amsterdam.
- Hug A. (1924), „Lanipendia“, in: *RE* 12/1, 689–690.
- (1937), „Pensum“, in: *RE* 19/1, 498–499.
- Hunger, Herbert (1961), „Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur“, in: *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur*, I, *Antikes und mittelalterliches Buch- und Schriftwesen. Überlieferungsgeschichte der antiken Literatur*, Zürich, 207–283.
- Hunt, Arthur S. / Johnson, John (eds.) (1930), *Two Theocritus Papyri*, London.

- Ihm, Sibylle (2002), *Clavis commentariorum der antiken medizinischen Texte*, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Ildefonse, Frédérique (1997), *La naissance de la grammaire dans l'antiquité grecque*, Paris.
- Ioannidou, Grace (ed.) (1996), *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Papyri in Berlin (P.Berol. inv. 21101-21299, 21911)*. BKT IX, Mainz am Rhein.
- Ippolito, Antonella (2005), „Heracleon [1]“, in: LGGA.
- Irigoin, Jean (1952), *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris.
- (1984), „Livres et textes dans les manuscrits byzantins de poètes. Continuité et innovations“, in: Cesare Questa / Renato Raffaelli (eds.), *Il libro e il testo*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Urbino, 20–23 settembre 1982, Urbino, 85–102.
- (1994), „Les éditions de textes“, in: Montanari 1994, 39–93 (reprinted in: Jean Irigoin, *La tradition des textes grecs. Pour une critique historique*, Paris 2003, 133–173).
- Jacob, Christian (1999), „Du livre au texte: pour une histoire comparée des philologies“, in: *Quaderni di storia* 50, 61–93 (= Christian Jacob / Juliet Vale (1999), „From Book to Text: Towards a Comparative History of Philologies“, in: *Diogenes* 47, 4–22).
- Janko, Richard (1995a), „Crates of Mallos, Dionysius Thrax and the Tradition of Stoic Grammatical Theory“, in: Lewis Ayres (ed.), *The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical Traditions Presented to Professor I. G. Kidd*, New Brunswick-London, 213–233.
- (1995b), „Reconstructing Philodemus' *On Poems*“, in: Dirk Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry. Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus and Horace*, New York-Oxford, 69–96.
- (ed.) (2000), *Philodemus, On poems, Book 1*, edited with introduction, translation, and commentary, Oxford.
- Julien, Jacques (1985), „Mode verbale et diathesis chez Apollonius Dyscole“, in: *Histoire, épistémologie, langage* 7/1, 83–125.
- Kaster, Robert A. (1988), *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Kemp, Alan (1991), „The Emergence of Autonomous Greek Grammar“, in: Schmitter 1991, 302–333.
- Kirk, Geoffrey S. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, I, Books 1–4, Cambridge.
- Kleinlogel, Alexander (1964), „Beobachtungen zu den Thukydidescholien, I“, in: *Philologus* 108, 233–246.
- (1965), *Geschichte des Thukydides textes im Mittelalter*, Berlin.
- (1998), „Beobachtungen zu den Thukydidescholien, II“, in: *Philologus* 142, 11–40.

- Knaack, Georg (1903), „Aristodemos“, in: RE Suppl. 1, 133.
- Koster, Willem J. W. (1963), „Aristophane dans la tradition byzantine“, in: *Revue des études grecques* 76, 381–396.
- Kouremenos, Theokritos / Parássoglou, George / Tsantsanoglou, Kyriakos (eds.) (2006), *The Derveni Papyrus*, edited with introduction and commentary, Florence.
- Krüger, Julian (1990), *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit. Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption*, Frankfurt am Main.
- La Roche, Jacob (1866), *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum. Nebst einem Anhang über die Homerhandschriften*, Leipzig.
- Lallot, Jean (1987), „Le grammairien grec et le texte: l'exemple d'Apollonius Dyscole“, in: *Le texte et ses représentations*, Paris, 145–157.
- (1994), „Le problème des fonctions syntaxiques chez Apollonius Dyscole“, in: Jan De Clercq / Piet Desmet (eds.), *Florilegium historiographiae linguisticae. Études d'historiographie de la linguistique et de grammaire comparée à la mémoire de Maurice Leroy*, Leuven, 131–141.
- (1995a), „Analogie et pathologie dans la grammaire alexandrine“, in: *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature*. 15 (Aussois, 29 août–3 septembre 1994), Paris, 109–123.
- (1995b), „Qu'est-ce que la grammaire?“, in: *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature*. 15 (Aussois, 29 août–3 septembre 1994), Paris, 73–82.
- (ed.) (1997), *Apollonius Dyscole, De la construction / Peri syntaxeos*, texte grec accompagné de notes critiques, introduction, traduction, notes exégétiques, I–II, Paris.
- (1998), „*Grammatici certant*: vers une typologie de l'argumentation *pro et contra* dans la question de l'authenticité de la *Techne*“, in: Vivien Law / Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Techne grammatike*, Münster, 27–39.
- (ed.) (1998²), *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, traduite et annotée, 2^e éd. revue et augmentée, Paris 1^{re} éd. 1989).
- Lambert, Frédéric (1978), „Le terme et la notion de διόθεσις chez Apollonius Dyscole“, in: Varron. *Grammaire antique et stylistique latine* (Recueil offert à Jean Collart), Paris, 245–252.
- (2000), „La linguistique grecque chez les alexandrins: Aristophane de Byzance et Aristarque“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*, I, 1, 1, Berlin–New York, 385–394.

- Lamberton, Robert (2001), „Schools of Platonic Philosophy of the Roman Empire: the Evidence of the Biographies“, in: Yun Lee Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 433-458.
- Lamberz, Erich (1987), „Proklos und die Form des philosophischen Kommentars“, in: Pépin/Saffrey 1987, 1-20.
- Law, Vivien (2003), *The History of Linguistics in Europe from Plato to 1600*, Cambridge-New York.
- Leanza, Sandro (1995), „L'esegesi biblica cristiana antica: scoli e catene“, in: Claudio Moreschini (ed.), *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in età tardoantica*. Atti del Terzo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi, Napoli, 209-227.
- Lehrs, Karl (1837), *Quaestiones epicae*, Königsberg.
- (1882³), *De Aristarchi studiis Homericis*, Leipzig (1st ed. 1833).
- Lemerle, Paul (1971), *Le premier humanisme byzantin. Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*, Paris.
- Lersch, Laurenz (1838-1841), *Die Sprachphilosophie der Alten*, I-III, Bonn.
- LGGA = Montanari, Franco / Lapini, Walter / Montana, Fausto / Pagni, Lara (eds.), *Lessico dei Grammatici Greci Antichi* (www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga).
- Linke, Konstanze (ed.) (1977), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax*, (SGLG 3), Berlin-New York.
- Lobel, Edgar (1952), „P.Oxy. 2258“, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XX, London.
- Lossau, Manfred J. (1964), *Untersuchungen zur antiken Demosthenesexegese*, Bad Homburg.
- Lowe, Elias A. (1934-1972), *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century*, I-XI + Suppl., Oxford.
- Lundon, John (1997), „Σχόλια: una questione non marginale“, in: *Discentibus obuius*. Omaggio degli allievi a Domenico Magnino, Como, 73-86.
- Luppe, Wolfgang (2002), „Σχόλια, ὑπομνήματα und ὑποθέσεις zu griechischen Dramen auf Papyri“, in: Wilhelm Geerlings / Christian Schulze (eds.), *Der Kommentar in Antike und Mittelalter. Beiträge zu seiner Erforschung*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 55-77.
- Luschnat, Otto (1954), „Die Thukydidescholien. Zu ihrer handschriftlichen Grundlage, Herkunft und Geschichte“, in: *Philologus* 98, 14-58.
- Luzzatto, Maria Jagoda (1993a), „Itinerari di codici antichi: un'edizione di Tucidide tra il II e il IX secolo“, in: *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 30, 167-203.
- (1993b), „Scholia tardoantichi: il commentario di Marcellino a Tucidide“, in: *Quaderni di storia* 38, 111-115.
- Maas, Paul (ed.) (1911), *Apollonius Dyscolus, De pronomibus. Pars generalis*, Bonn.

- Maehler, Herwig (1968), „Ein Fragment aus Aristophanes' *Rittern* mit Scholien“, in: *Hermes* 96, 287-293.
- (1994), „Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholien-corpora der Handschriften“, in: Montanari 1994, 95-127.
- (1998), „Élites urbaines et production littéraire en Égypte romaine et byzantine“, in: *Gaia* 3, 81-95.
- (2000), „L'évolution matérielle de l'hypomnème jusqu'à la basse époque. Le cas du POxy. 856 (Aristophane) et PWürzburg 1 (Euripide)“, in: Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*. Actes du colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles (Paris et Villejuif, 22-25 septembre 1999), Paris, 29-36.
- Majcherek, Grzegorz (2008), „Academic Life of Late Antique Alexandria: a Viewpoint from the Field“, in: Mostafa El-Abbadi / Omnia Mounir Fathallah (eds.), *What Happened to the Ancient Library of Alexandria?*, Leiden-Boston, 191-206.
- Manetti, Daniela (1998), „Commento ed enciclopedia“, in: Salvatore Settis (ed.), *I Greci*, II/III, Torino, 1199-1220.
- Manfredi, Manfredo (2000), „Un frammento di Aristofane, *I cavalieri*, con scoli“, in: Henri Melaerts (ed.), *Papyri in honorem Johannis Bingen octogenarii (P.Bingen)*, Leuven, 95-104.
- Maniaci, Marilena (2000), „Stratégies de juxtaposition du texte et du commentaire dans quelques manuscrits d'Homère“, in: Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Le commentaire entre tradition et innovation*. Actes du colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles (Paris et Villejuif, 22-25 septembre 1999), Paris, 65-76.
- (2002), „«La serva padrona». Interazioni fra testo e glossa sulla pagina del manoscritto“, in: Vincenzo Fera / Giacomo Ferraù / Silvia Rizzo (eds.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 26 september-3 october 1998, as the 12th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records, Messina, 3-35.
- (2006a), „Problemi di *mise en page* dei manoscritti con commento a cornice. L'esempio di alcuni testimoni dell'*Iliade*“, in: *Segno e testo* 4, 211-297.
- (2006b), „Words Within Words: Layout Strategies in Some Glossed Manuscripts of the *Iliad*“, in: *Manuscripta* 50, 241-268.
- Marin, Demetrio (1969), „Dionisio di Alicarnasso e il latino“, in: Jacqueline Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, I-III, Bruxelles, 595-607.
- Mársico, Claudia T. (2006), „¿Una crítica de Apolonio Discolo a la “Téchne grammatiké”? Enfoques en torno de la noción de “diáthesis” en la grámatica griega antigua“ in: *Cuadernos de filología clásica. Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 16, 23-44.
- Martin, Victor / Budé, Guy de (eds.) (1928), *Eschine, Discours*, II, texte et traduction, Paris.

- Marzi, Mario / Leone, Pietro / Malcovati, Enrica (eds.) (1977), *Oratori attici minori*, I, *Iperide, Eschine, Licurgo*, Torino.
- Matthaios, Stephanos (1996), „Κύριον ὄνομα. Zur Geschichte eines grammatischen Terminus“, in: Pierre Swiggers / Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Ancient Grammar. Content and Context*, Leuven, 55–77.
- (1999), *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs. Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*, Göttingen.
- (2001), „Das Wortartensystem der Alexandriner. Skizze seiner Entwicklungsgeschichte und Nachwirkung“, in: *Göttinger Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 5, 65–94 (reprinted in: Ioannis G. Taifacos (ed.), *The Origins of European Scholarship*. The Cyprus Millennium International Conference, Stuttgart 2005, 13–39).
- (2002), „Neue Perspektiven für die Historiographie der antiken Grammatik. Das Wortartensystem der Alexandriner“, in: Swiggers/Wouters 2002a, 161–220.
- (2003), „Tryphon aus Alexandria: Der erste Syntaxtheoretiker vor Apollonios Dyskolos?“, in: Pierre Swiggers / Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Syntax in Antiquity*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley, 97–132.
- (2004), „Die Syntaxtheorie bei den alexandrinischen Grammatikern: Das Beispiel Tryphons aus Alexandria“, in: Gerda Hassler / Gesina Volkmann (eds.), *History of Linguistics in Texts and Concepts / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft in Texten und Konzepten*, Münster, 87–100.
- (2009), „Aristarch, Dionysios Thrax und die Τέχνη γραμματική. Zur Echtheitsdiskussion des ersten Lehrbuchs über die Grammatik“, in: Eleni Karamalengou / Eugenia Makrygianni (eds.), *Ἀντιφίλησις. Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture*. In Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou, Stuttgart, 386–400.
- (2010a), „Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Lesarten seiner ‘Grammatik’-Definition“, in: Matthaios/Montanari/Rengakos 2010.
- (2010b), „Textinterpretation und grammatische Argumentation im Kreis der alexandrinischen Philologen. Konsequenzen für die ἐμπειρία-τέχνη-Diskussion“, in: Nikolai Kazansky / Vladimir I. Mazhuga / Larissa Stepanova / Pierre Swiggers / Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Ancient Grammar and Its Posterior Tradition*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley, forthcoming.
- (2010c), „Von Aristoteles zu den Grammatikern. Die εἰκὼν-Definition (Aristot. *Rh.* 3, 10) und die Entstehung des grammatischen Terminus πρόθεσις“, in: *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 138, forthcoming.
- Matthaios, Stephanos / Montanari, Franco / Rengakos, Antonios (eds.) (2010), *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar. Archetypes, Concepts, and Contents*. Proceedings of the 2nd Trends in Classics international conference (Thessaloniki, 5th–7th December 2008), Berlin–New York.
- Matthews, Peter H. (2007), „The Ancient Grammarians“, in: Anastasios-Phoivos Christidis / Maria Arapopoulou / Maria Chriti (eds.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge–New York

- (revised and expanded translation of: *Istoria tis Ellinikis glossas: apo tis arches eos tin ysteri archaiotita*, Thessaloniki 2001), 1193–1200.
- Matthias, Theodor (1883), „De Apollonii Dyscoli epirrhematici et syndesmici forma genuina“, in: *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 6, 1–92.
- Mazal, Otto (ed.) (1998), *Der Wiener Dioskurides. Codex medicus Graecus 1 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, I, Graz.
- McNamee, Kathleen (1977), *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri*, Diss. Duke University, Durham.
- (1981), „Greek Literary Papyri Revised by Two or More Hands“, in: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology*, Chico, CA, 79–91.
- (1995), „Missing Links in the Development of Scholia“, in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 36, 399–414.
- (1997), „An Innovation in Annotated Codices on Papyrus“, in: Bärbel Kramer / Wolfgang Luppe / Herwig Maehler / Günther Poethke (eds.), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses*, Berlin, 13–19 August 1995, Stuttgart, II 669–678.
- (1998), „Another Chapter in the History of Scholia“, in: *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 48, 269–288.
- (2007), *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt*, [New Haven, Conn.].
- McNelis, Charles (2002), „Greek Grammarians and Roman Society During the Early Empire: Statius’ Father and his Contemporaries“, in: *Classical Antiquity* 21, 67–94.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold (1959), „Kritische Beiträge, III, Ein Aeschines-Papyrus“, in: Hellfried Dahmann / Reinhold Merkelbach (eds.), *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik* (Günther Jachmann zur fünfzigsten Wiederkehr seiner Promotion gewidmet), Köln, 162–164.
- Messori Savorelli, Gabriella / Pintaudi, Rosario (1997), „Frammenti di rotoli letterari laurenziani“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 115, 171–177.
- (2002), „I lettori dei papiri: dal commento autonomo agli scolii“, in: Vincenzo Fera / Giacomo Ferrau / Silvia Rizzo (eds.), *Talking to the Text: Marginalia from Papyri to Print*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 26 september–3 october 1998, as the 12th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records, Messina, 37–57.
- Mette, Hans J. (1952), *Parateresis. Untersuchungen zur Sprachtheorie des Krates von Pergamon*, Halle.
- Monaco, Matteo (2000), „La tradizione manoscritta di Eschine tra i papiri e i codici medievali“, in: *Aegyptus* 80, 3–98.
- Montana, Fausto (2000), „Le note marginali ai Cavalieri di Aristofane nel papiro Oxford Bodl. Ms. Gr. Class. f. 72 (P)“, in: *Eikasmós* 11, 85–96.

- (2001a), „I *marginalia* di *P.Bingen* 18 e l'interpretazione di *Ar. Eq.* 1008“, in: *Eikasmós* 12, 161-172.
- (2001b), „Uno scolio del tipo “οὐκ ἀργῶς” ad *Aristoph., Equ.* 551 in *P.Berol.* 21105?“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 135, 21-22.
- (2004), „I grammatici alessandrini nei papiri di Aristofane“, in: Roberto Pretagostini / Emanuele Dettori (eds.), *La cultura ellenistica. L'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica*. Atti del Convegno COFIN 2001, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata”, 22-24 settembre 2003, Roma, 371-384.
- (2005), „L'esegesi ad Aristofane su papiro“, in: Fausto Montana (ed.), *Interpretazioni antiche di Aristofane*, Sarzana (then: Roma 2006), 1-53.
- (ed.) (2006a), *Aristophanes*, in: CLGP I.1.4 (*Aristophanes-Bacchylides*), 3-240.
- (2006b), „Didymus [1]“, in: LGGA.
- (2006c), „L'anello mancante: l'esegesi ad Aristofane tra l'antichità e Bisanzio“, in: Guido Avezzù / Paolo Scattolin (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*. Atti del convegno, Rovereto, 20 ottobre 2006, Rovereto, 17-34.
- (2009a), „Nicanor [3]“, in: LGGA.
- (2009b), „Storici, filologi, storici-filologi: intersezioni nella cultura ellenistica“, in: Francesca Gazzano / Gabriella Ottone / Luigi Santi Amantini (eds.), *Ingenia Asiatica. Fortuna e tradizione di storici d'Asia Minore*. Atti della prima giornata di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria, Genova, 31 maggio 2007, Roma, 157-181.
- (2010), „Due note di lessico scoliastico: παρακείμενον σχόλιον e παραγράφεσθαι“, in: Fausto Montana (ed.), *Aner polytropos*. Ricerche di filologia greca antica dedicate dagli allievi a Franco Montanari, Roma, 185-195.
- Montanari, Franco (1979), „I *prolegomena* del codice Rom. Bibl. Naz. gr. 6 (C)“, in: Id., *Studi di filologia omerica antica*, I, Pisa, 43-75.
- (1993), „L'erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica“, in: Giuseppe Cambiano / Luciano Canfora / Diego Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo* (II, *L'Ellenismo*), Roma, 235-281.
- (ed.) (1994), *La philologie grecque à l'époque hellénistique et romaine: sept exposés suivis de discussions*. XL Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique – Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres-Genève.
- (1997), „The Fragments of Hellenistic Scholarship“, in: Glenn W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen, 273-288.
- (1998), „Zenodotus, Aristarchus and the Ekdosis of Homer“, in: Glenn W. Most (ed.), *Editing Texts / Texte edieren*, Göttingen, 1-21.
- (2000), „Ripensamenti di Aristarco sul testo omerico e il problema della seconda *ekdosis*“, in: Maria Cannatà Fera / Simonetta Grandolini (eds.), *Poesia e religione in Grecia*. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera, Napoli, 479-486.

- (2002), „Alexandrian Homeric Philology. The Form of the *ekdosis* and the *variae lectiones*“, in: Michael Reichel / Antonios Rengakos (eds.), *Epea Pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homerforschung*. Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag, Stuttgart, 119–140.
 - (2004), „La filologia omerica antica e la storia del testo omerico“, in: Anton Bierl / Arbogast Schmitt / Andreas Willi, *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*. Festschrift für Joachim Latacz, München, 127–143.
 - (2006), „Glossario, parafrasi, ‘edizione commentata’ nei papiri“, in: Guido Avezzù / Paolo Scattolin (eds.), *I classici greci e i loro commentatori. Dai papiri ai marginalia rinascimentali*. Atti del convegno, Rovereto, 20 ottobre 2006, Rovereto, 9–15.
 - (2009a), „A new papyrus commentary on the *Iliad*“, in: Franco Montanari / Serena Perrone (eds.), *Fragments of the Past. Ancient Scholarship and Greek Papyri, Trends in Classics* 1/2, 173–178.
 - (2009b), „*Ekdosis* alessandrina: il libro e il testo“, in: Manuel Sanz Morales / Myriam Librán Moreno (eds.), *Verae Lectiones. Estudios de crítica textual y edición de textos griegos*, Huelva-Cáceres, 143–167 (Pl. 1–8).
 - (2009c), „Un papiro di Eschine con correzioni (*P.Oxy.* 2404): considerazioni sull’*ekdosis* alessandrina“, in: *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 55, 401–411.
- Most, Glenn W. (ed.) (1999), *Commentaries / Kommentare*, Göttingen 1999.
- Mountford, James F. (ed.) (1934), *The Scholia Bembina*, London.
- Müller, Bruno A. (1903), *De Asclepiade Myrleano*, Diss. Leipzig.
- Nagy, Gregory (2000), review of West 1998–2000, in: *The Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.09.12.
- (2003), review of West 2001a, in: *Gnomon* 75, 481–501.
- (2010), *Homer the Classic*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Nardelli, Jean-Fabrice (2001), review of Martin L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias*, II, München–Leipzig 2000, in: *The Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2001.06.21.
- Nauck, August (1848), *Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Halle.
- Neri, Camillo (ed.) (2003), *Erinna. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Bologna.
- Nickau, Klaus (1972), „Zenodotos (3)“, in: *RE* 10A, 23–45.
- (1977), *Untersuchungen zur Textkritische Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos*, Berlin–New York.
- Nicolai, Roberto (1992), *La storiografia nell’educazione antica*, Pisa.
- Norden, Eduard (1901), „Vergils *Aeneis* im Lichte ihrer Zeit“, in: *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 7, 249–334 (= Id., *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum*, Berlin 1966, 358–421).
- NP = Cancik, Hubert / Schneider, Helmuth (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*, Stuttgart–Weimar, 1996–2005.

- Page, Denis L. (ed.) (1962), *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford.
- Pagani, Lara (2006a), „Apollonius [9] Dyscolus“, in: LGGA.
- (2006b), „Tyrannion [1] Maior“, in: LGGA.
- Pantiglioni, Massimo (1998), „Il termine δῖαθεσις nella linguistica classica e Dionisio Trace“, in: *Athenaeum* 86, 251-261.
- Papathomas, Amphiloichios (2003), „Scholien auf literarischen Papyri als Zeugnisse für philologische Tätigkeit in der Peripherie der griechisch-römischen Welt“, in: *Classica et mediaevalia* 54, 255-286.
- Parker, David C. / Birdsall, James N. (2004), „The Date of the Codex Zacynthius (Ξ): A New Proposal“, in: *The Journal of Theological Studies* 55, 117-131.
- Pasquali, Giorgio (1920), *Filologia e storia*, Firenze.
- (1952²), *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze (I^a ed. 1934).
- Patillon, Michel (1990), „Contribution à la lecture de la *Techne* de Denys le Thrace“, in: *Revue des études grecques* 103, 693-698.
- Pecere, Oronzo (1986), „La tradizione dei testi latini tra IV e V secolo attraverso i libri sottoscritti“, in: Andrea Giardina (ed.), *Società romana e impero tardoantico*, IV, *Tradizione dei classici. Trasformazioni della cultura*, Roma-Bari, 19-81, 210-246.
- Pecorella, Giovan Battista (ed.) (1962), *Dionisio Trace, Techne grammatike*, testo critico e commento, Bologna.
- Pekridou-Gorecki, Anastasia (2009), „Textiles, Production of, II, Classical Antiquity“, in: Hubert Cancik / Helmut Schneider (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, Leiden-Boston, XIV 342-346.
- Pépin, Jean / Saffrey, Henri D. (eds.) (1987), *Proclus lecteur et interprète des anciens*. Actes du colloque international du CNRS, Paris, 2-4 octobre 1985, Paris.
- Perrone, Serena (2006), „Hypsicrates“, in: LGGA.
- Pertusi, Agostino (1951), „Intorno alla tradizione manoscritta degli scolii di Proclo ad Esiodo, IV“, in: *Aevum* 25, 147-159.
- (ed.) (1955), *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Milano.
- Petit, Françoise (ed.) (1977), *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, I, *Catena Sinaitica*, Turnhout-Leuven.
- (ed.) (1986), *Catenae Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, II, *Collectio Coisliniana in Genesim*, Turnhout-Leuven.
- Petraccia, Maria Federica (2003), „Catallage, lanipendia apula“, in: Alfredo Buonopane / Francesca Cenerini (eds.), *Donna e lavoro nella documentazione epigrafica*. Atti del I Seminario sulla condizione femminile nella documentazione epigrafica, Bologna, 21 novembre 2002, Faenza, 255-259.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf (ed.) (1949-1953), *Callimachus*, I, *Fragmenta*; II, *Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford.

- (1968), *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Piccirilli, Luigi (ed.) (1985), *Storie dello storico Tucidide. Edizione, traduzione e commento delle Vite*, Genova.
- Pinborg, Jan (1975), *Classical Antiquity: Greece*, in: Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, XIII, *Historiography of Linguistics*, The Hague-Paris, I 69-126.
- Pizzocaro, Massimo (1993), „Un profilo di Telesilla, famosa poetessa d'Argo, e guerriera“, in: *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Sezione filologico-letteraria*, 15, 88-103.
- Pohlenz, Max (1939), „Die Begründung der abendländischen Sprachlehre durch die Stoa“, in: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen* n.F. 3, 151-198 (reprinted in: Id., *Kleine Schriften*, ed. by Heinrich Dörrie, Hildesheim 1965, 19-86).
- Pollack, Erwin (1903), „Desultor“, in: *RE* 5/1, 255-259.
- Pontani, Filippomaria (2002a), review of Matthaïos 1999, in: *Gnomon* 74, 255-257.
- (2002b), review of Matthaïos 1999, in: *Hellenika* 52, 145-155.
- (ed.) (2005a), *Eraclito. Questioni omeriche. Sulle allegorie di Omero in merito agli dèi*, Pisa.
- (2005b), *Sguardi su Ulisse. Tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*, Roma.
- (ed.) (2007), *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*, I, *Scholia ad libros α-β*, Roma.
- (ed.) (2010), *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam*, II, *Scholia ad libros γ-δ*, Roma.
- Porro, Antonietta (1985), „Manoscritti in maiuscola alessandrina di contenuto profano. Aspetti grafici, codicologici, filologici“, in: *Scrittura e civiltà* 9, 169-215.
- (ed.) (2004), „Alcaeus“, in: *CLGP* I.1.1 (Aeschines-Alcaeus), 75-246.
- (2009), „Forms and genres of Alexandrian exegesis on lyric poets“, in: Franco Montanari / Serena Perrone (eds.), *Fragments of the Past. Ancient Scholarship and Greek Papyri*, *Trends in Classics* 1/2, 183-202.
- Prencipe, Vittoria (2002), „Statuto epistemologico della “grammatica” nell'antichità greca“, in: Swiggers/Wouters 2002a, 23-68.
- Rashed, Marwan (1995), „Alexandre d'Aphrodise et la «magna quaestio». Rôle et indépendance des scholies dans la tradition byzantine du corpus aristotélicien“, in: *Les études classiques* 63, 295-351 (reprinted in: Id., *L'héritage aristotélicien. Texts inédits de l'Antiquité*, Paris 2007, 85-141).
- (ed.) (2009), *Alexandre d'Aphrodise, Commentaire perdu à la “Physique” d'Aristote (livres IV-VIII). Les scholies byzantines*, édition, traduction et commentaire, Berlin-New York.
- Razzetti, Francesca (2002), *I frammenti del grammatico Aristonico*, Tesi di Dottorato, Genova.

- (2003a), „Aristonicus“, in: LGGA.
- (2003b), „Philoxenus“, in: LGGA.
- RE = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart-München, 1893-1978.
- Reitzenstein, Richard (1897), *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz*, Leipzig.
- Rengakos, Antonios (2002a), review of West 2001a, in: *The Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2002.11.15.
- (2002b), „The Hellenistic Poets as Homeric Critics“, in: Franco Montanari (ed.), *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del congresso di Genova*, 6-8 luglio 2000, con la collaborazione di Paola Ascheri, Roma, 143-157.
- Reynolds, Leighton D. / Wilson, Nigel G. (1991³), *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford (1st ed. 1968).
- Ribbach, Willy E. (1883), *De Aristarchi Samothracis arte grammatica*, Naumburg.
- Richard, Marcel (1950), „Ἀπὸ φωνῆς“, in: *Byzantion* 20, 191-222.
- Richardson, Nicholas J. (1980), „Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the *Iliad*. A Sketch“, in: *Classical Quarterly* 30, 265-287.
- (1994), „Aristotle and Hellenistic Scholarship“, in: Montanari 1994, 7-28.
- Rispoli, Gioia M. (1988), *Lo spazio del verisimile: il racconto, la storia e il mito*, Napoli.
- Robert, Louis (1940), „La bibliothèque de Nysa de Carie“, in: *Hellenica* 1, 144-148.
- Roberts, Colin H. (1935), „The Antinoë Fragment of Juvenal“, in: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 21, 199-207.
- Robins, Robert H. (1957), „Dionysius Thrax and the Western Grammatical Tradition“, in: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 67-106.
- (1966), „The Development of the Word Class System of the European Grammatical Tradition“, in: *Foundations of Language* 2, 3-19.
- (1996), „The Initial Section of the *Tékhnē grammatiké*“, in Pierre Swiggers / Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Ancient Grammar. Content and Context*, Leuven-Paris, 3-15.
- (1998), „The Authenticity of the *Technē*: the *status quaestionis*“, in: Vivien Law / Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the *Technē grammatikē**, Münster, 13-26.
- Romano, Francesco (1994), „La scuola filosofica e il commento“, in: Giuseppe Cambiano / Luciano Canfora / Diego Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, I, *La produzione e la circolazione del testo* (III, *I Greci e Roma*), Roma, 587-611.
- Russell, Donald A. / Konstan, David (eds.) (2005), *Heracitus, Homeric Problems*, Atalanta.
- Russo, Joseph (1993⁴) (ed.), *Omero, Odissea*, V, *Libri XVII-XX*, trad. di Giuseppe Aurelio Privitera, Milano (1st ed. 1985).

- Rutherford, William G. (1905), *A Chapter in the History of Annotation, being Scholia Aristophanica III*, London.
- Saffrey, Henri D. / Segonds, Alain-Philippe (eds.) (2001), *Marinus, Proclus ou Sur le bonheur*, avec la collaboration de Concetta Luna, Paris.
- Sandys, John E. (1921³), *A History of Classical Scholarship*, I, *From the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge (1st ed. 1903).
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M. (1984), „Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics, II, Stoic and Peripatetic Kinds of Speech Act and the Distinction of Grammatical Moods“, in: *Mnemosyne* 37, 291–353.
- (1990a), „Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics, III, The Stoic Τέχνη περὶ φωνῆς“, in: *Mnemosyne* 43, 86–108.
- (1990b), „Studies in the History of Ancient Linguistics, IV, Developments in the Study of Ancient Linguistics“, in: *Mnemosyne* 43, 289–306.
- (1994), „Scholarship and Grammar“, in: Montanari 1994, 263–306.
- (1998), „The Linguistic Contents of Dionysius’ Παραγγέλματα“, in: Vivien Law / Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē grammatike*, Münster, 41–53.
- (1999), review of Ildefonse 1997, in: *Mnemosyne* 52, 606–607.
- (2000), review of Matthaios 1999, in: *The Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.07.14.
- Schironi, Francesca (2009), „Theory into practice: Aristotelian principles in Aristarchean philology“, in: *Classical Philology* 104, 279–316.
- Schmidt, Martin (1976), *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias*, München.
- (1997), „Variae lectiones oder Parallelstellen: Was notierten Zenodot und Aristarch zu Homer?“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 115, 1–12.
- Schmidt, Mauricius (ed.) (1854), *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Schmidt, Moriz (1852–1853), „Dionys der Thraker“, in: *Philologus* 7, 360–382; *ibid.* 8, 231–253, 510–520.
- Schmidt, Peter L. (1999), „Iunius Filagrius [III 2]“, in: *NP* 6, 70–71.
- Schmidt, Rudolph T. (1839), *Stoicorum grammatica*, Halle.
- Schmitter, Peter (ed.) (1991), *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie*, II, *Sprachtheorien der abendländischen Antike*, Tübingen.
- (2000), „Sprachbezogene Reflexionen im frühen Griechenland“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage*.

- Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours*, I, 1, 1, Berlin-New York, 345-366.
- Schneider, Otto (1845), „Über die Schlussparthie der Schrift des Apollonius Dyscolus Περί ἐπιρρημάτων“, in: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 3, 446-459.
- Schneider, Richard (1869), „Zu Apollonios Dyscolos, III“, in: *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 24, 585-596.
- (ed.) (1878), *Grammatici Graeci*, II/I, *Apollonii scripta minora*, Leipzig.
- (ed.) (1902), *Grammatici Graeci*, II/II, *Commentarius criticus et exegeticus in Apollonii scripta minora*, Leipzig.
- (ed.) (1910), *Grammatici Graeci*, II/III, *Librorum Apollonii deperditorum fragmenta*, Leipzig.
- Schneider, Richard / Uhlig, Gustav (eds.) (1878-1910), *Grammatici Graeci*, II, Leipzig.
- Schoemann, Georg F. (1862), *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den Alten*, Berlin.
- Schwartz, Eduard (1881), „De scholiis Homericis ad historiam fabularem pertinentibus“, in: *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Suppl.* 12, 403-463.
- (ed.) (1887), *Scholia in Euripidem*, I, Berlin.
- (1895), *Aristodemos* (n. 30), *RE* 2/1, 925-926.
- Sciarra, Elisabetta (2005), *La tradizione degli scholia iliadici in Terra d'Otranto*, Roma.
- Serra, Giuseppe (1995), „Sulla tradizione araba“, in: Giuseppe Cambiano / Luciano Canfora / Diego Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, II, *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma, 251-261.
- Siebenborn, Elmar (1976), *Die Lehre von der Sprachrichtigkeit und ihren Kriterien. Studien zur antiken normativen Grammatik*, Amsterdam.
- Skrzeczkza, Rudolph F. L. (1853), „Die Lehre des Apollonius Dyscolus von den Redetheilen und kritische Bemerkungen zu Apollonius *de adverbio*“, in: *Zur öffentlichen Prüfung im Kneiphöfischen Stadt-Gymnasium Königsberg*, 1-28.
- Slater, William J. (1972), „Asklepiades and Historia“, in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 13, 317-333.
- (ed.) (1986), *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, (SGLG 6), Berlin-New York.
- Sluiter, Ineke (1990), *Ancient Grammar in Context. Contributions to the Study of Ancient Linguistic Thought*, Amsterdam.
- (1999), „Commentaries and the Didactic Tradition“, in: Most 1999, 173-205.
- (2000a), „Language and Thought in Stoic Philosophy“, in: Sylvain Auroux / Ernst F. K. Koerner / Hans-Joseph Niederehe / Kees Versteegh (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from Beginnings to the Present / Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaften. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung*

- von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart / Histoire des sciences du langage. Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude du langage des origines à nos jours, I, 1, 1, Berlin-New York, 375-384.
- (2000b), „The Dialectics of Genre: Some Aspects of Secondary Literature and Genre in Antiquity“, in: Depew/Obbink 2000, 183-203.
- Smith, Ole L. (1975), *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus*, I, *The recensiones of Demetrius Triclinius*, Leiden.
- (ed.) (1976), *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia*, Pars I: *Scholia in Agamemnonem Choephoros Eumenides Supplices continens*, Leipzig.
- (1981), „Classification of MSS of the Scholia on Aeschylus“, in: *Illinois Classical Studies* 6, 44-55.
- Smith, Peter M. (1981), „Aineiadaí as Patrons of *Iliad* XX and the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite“, in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 85, 17-58.
- Smyth, Herbert W. (1933), „Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Aeschylus“, in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 44, 1-62.
- Sodano, Angelo R. (ed.) (1970), *Porphirii Quaestionum Homericarum liber I*, Napoli.
- Solmsen, Friedrich (1986), „Aeneas founded Rome with Odysseus“, in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90, 93-110.
- Sorabji, Richard (ed.) (1990), *Aristotle Transformed. The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*, London.
- (ed.) (2004), *The Philosophy of the Commentators: 200-600 A.D.: A Sourcebook*, II, *Physics*, London.
- Steinthal, Heymann (1890-1891²), *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Logik*, I-II, Berlin (1st ed. 1863).
- Stroppa, Marco (2009), „Some Remarks Regarding Commentaries on Codex from Late Antiquity“, in: Franco Montanari / Serena Perrone (eds.), *Fragments of the Past. Ancient Scholarship and Greek Papyri, Trends in Classics* 1/2, 298-327.
- Susemihl, Franz (1891-1892), *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I-II, Leipzig.
- Swiggers, Pierre / Wouters, Alfons (1995), „*Techne* et *empeiria*: la dynamique de la grammaire grecque dans l'antiquité à la lumière des papyrus grammaticaux“, in: *Lalies. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature*. 15 (Aussois, 29 août-3 septembre 1994), Paris, 83-100.
- (2000), „Grammaires grecques (et latines) sur papyrus“, in: Mario De Nonno / Paolo de Paolis / Louis Holtz (eds.), *Manuscripts and Tradition of Grammatical Texts from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Proceedings of a Conference held at Erice, 16-23 October 1997, as the 11th Course of International School for the Study of Written Records, Cassino, I 59-88.
- (eds.) (2002a), *Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity*, Leuven-Paris-Sterling.

- (2002b), „Grammatical Theory and Philosophy of Language in Antiquity: Introduction“, in: Swiggers/Wouters 2002a, 9–20.
- (2002c), „Grammatical Theory in Aristotle’s *Poetics*, Chapter XX“, in: Swiggers/Wouters 2002a, 101–120.
- (2003), „Réflexions à propos de (l’absence de?) la syntaxe dans la grammaire gréco-latine“, in: Pierre Swiggers / Alfons Wouters (eds.), *Syntax in Antiquity*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley, 25–41.
- (2005), „L’élaboration de la grammaire comme discipline ‘technique’“, in: Ioannis G. Taifacos (2005), *The Origins of European Scholarship*. The Cyprus Millennium International Conference, Stuttgart, 1–12.

- Taylor, Daniel J. (1987), „Rethinking the History of Language Science in Classical Antiquity“, in: Id. (ed.), *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 1–16.
- Tessier, Andrea (ed.) (2005), *Demetrio Triclinio, Scolii metrici alla tetrade sofodeia*, Alessandria.
- Theodoridis, Christos (ed.) (1976), *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*, (SGLG 2), Berlin–New York.
- Thiel, Helmut van (1992), „Zenodot, Aristarch und Andere“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 90, 1–32.
- (1997), „Der Homertext in Alexandria“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 115, 13–36.
- (2000), „Die *D-Scholien* der *Ilias* in den Handschriften“, in: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132, 1–62 (partially available at: <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/volltexte/2006/1810/>).
- Tosi, Renzo / Rüpk, Jörg (1998), „Grammatiker“, in: NP 4, 1199–1203.
- Trojahn, Silke (2002), *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur Alten Komödie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie*, München–Leipzig.
- Turner, Eric G. (ed.) (1957), „P.Oxy. 2404. Aeschines, In Ctesiphontem 51–53“, in: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XXIV, London, 130–132.
- (1980²), *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford–New York (1st ed. 1968).
- Turner, Eric G. / Parsons, Peter J. (1987), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Second Edition revised and enlarged, London.
- Turyn, Alexander (1943), *The Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Aeschylus*, New York.
- (1952), *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Sophocles*, Urbana.
- (1957), *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana.

- Uhlig, Gustav (1882), „Zur Wiederherstellung des ältesten occidentalischen Compendium der Grammatik“, in: Festschrift zur Begrüssung der 36. phi-

- lologischen Versammlung an der Heidelberger Universität, Heidelberg, 61–85.
- (ed.) (1883), *Grammatici Graeci*, I/I, *Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica*, Leipzig.
- (ed.) (1910), *Grammatici Graeci*, II/II, *Apollonii Dyscoli de constructione libri quattuor*, Leipzig.
- Usener, Hermann (1892), „Ein altes Lehrgebäude der Philologie“, in: *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft* 4, 582–648 (reprinted in: Id., *Kleine Schriften*, II, Leipzig-Berlin 1913, 265–314).
- Valk, Marchinus van der (1963–1964), *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I–II, Leiden.
- Vallance, John T. (1999), „Galen, Proclus and the Non-submissive Commentary“, in: Most 1999, 223–244.
- Vanotti, Gabriella (1995), *L'altro Enea. La testimonianza di Dionigi di Alicarnasso*, Roma.
- Velsen, Arthur von (1853), *Tryphonis grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Berlin.
- Ventrella, Gianluca (2004), „Dionisio Trace e la definizione di grammatica“, in: *Kleos* 9, 103–110.
- Watts, Edwards J. (2006), *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Wendel, Carl (1920), *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien*, Berlin.
- (1941), „Philoxenos (n. 27)“, in: RE 20/1, 194–200.
- (1943), „Tyrannion (n. 2)“, in: RE 7A/2, 1811–1819.
- (1948), „Tyrannion (n. 3)“, in: RE 7A, 1819–1820.
- Wentzel, Georg (1896), „Asklepiades (n. 28)“, in: RE 2/2, 1628–1631.
- West, Martin L. (ed.) (1978), *Hesiod, Works and Days*, Oxford.
- (ed.) (1998–2000), *Homeri Ilias*, I–II, Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- (2001a), *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, München-Leipzig.
- (2001b), Response on Nagy and Nardelli, in: *The Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2001.09.06.
- White, John Williams (ed.) (1914), *The Scholia on the Aves of Aristophanes*, Boston-London.
- Wilson, Nigel G. (1967), „A Chapter in the History of Annotation“, in: *Classical Quarterly* n.s. 17, 244–256.
- (1971), „Two Notes on Byzantine Scholarship, I, The Vienna Dioscorides and the History of Scholia“, in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12, 557–558.
- (1977), review of Zuntz 1975, in: *Classical Review* n.s. 27, 271.
- (1983a), *Scholars of Byzantium*, London.
- (1983b), „Scoliasi e commentatori“, in: *Studi classici e orientali* 33, 83–112.

- (1984), *The Relation of Text and Commentary in Greek Books*, in: Cesare Questa / Renato Raffaelli (eds.), *Il libro e il testo*. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Urbino 20-23 settembre 1982, Urbino, 105-110.
- (2004), „La filologia greca nell’antichità“, in: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (ed.), *Introduzione alla filologia greca*, Roma (German ed.: Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997), 111-130.
- (2007), „Scholiasts and Commentators“, in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 47, 39-70.
- Wouters, Alfons (1979), *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the «Ars grammatica» in Antiquity*, Brussel.
- (1997), „The Grammatical Papyrus P.Berol. inv. 9917“, in: Bärbel Kramer / Wolfgang Luppe / Herwig Maehler / Günther Poethke (eds.), *Akten des 21. internationalen Papyrologenkongresses: Berlin, 13-19 August 1995*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, II 1021-1033.
- (1998), „The Grammatical Papyri and the *Techne grammatike* of Dionysius Thrax“, in: Vivien Law / Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Techne grammatike*, Münster, 95-109.

- Xenis, Georgios A. (ed.) (2010), *Scholia vetera in Sophoclis Trachinias*, Berlin-New York.

- Zetzel, James (1975), „On the History of Latin Scholia“, in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79, 335-354.
- Zuntz, Günther (1965), *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides*, Cambridge.
- (1975), *Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri*, Berlin (reprinted, with a *Nachwort*, from: *Byzantion* 13, 1938, 631-690; 14, 1939, 545-614).
- Zuretti, Carlo O. (1892), *Analecta Aristophanea*, Torino.

General index

- Achilles: 75, 77, 78
 Acusilaus
 fr.
 FGrHist 2 F 39: 75
 Adamnanus of Iona: 124 n. 59
 Aelius Stilo: 70 n. 17
 Aeneas: 65 and n. 1, 66 n. 3, 67
 and n. 7, 75, 76, 77 and n. 45
 Aeschines
 Against Ctesiphon
 51-53: 7-11
 162-163: 7-11
 Aeschylus: 156 n. 170; see also
 Scholia in Aeschylum
 Danaids: 7
 Diktyoulokoï: 5
 Persians: 109 n. 12
 Prometheus Bound: 109 n. 12
 Seven against Thebe: 109 n. 12
 Agamemnon: 73
 Agathocles of Cyzicus: 65 n. 1
 Ajax: 74
 Alcaeus: 92 n. 30, 113 and n. 23,
 134 and n. 94
 Alcinous: 80
 Alcman: 92 n. 30
 Alexander of Aphrodisia: 115 n. 25
 Alexander of Nicaea: 152 n. 152
 Alexander the Great: 141
 Alexandria: 72 n. 30, 111, 112 n.
 19, 115 n. 25, 141, 145, 154,
 155
 Ammonius Grammaticus: 125 n. 62
 Ammonius the Philosopher: 32 n.
 63
 Anacreon: 113 n. 23
 Anastasius I: 154
 Anastasius of Sinai: 106 n. 3
 Anaxagoras of Clazomenae
 fr.
 59 B17 D.-K.: 22 n. 23
 59 B19: 22 n. 23
 Andronicus Callistus: 109 n. 12
 Antinupolis: 144
 Antioch: 112 n. 19
 Apion
 fr.
 FGrHist 616 F 25: 81 n. 57
 Apollo: 82 n. 59
 Apollodorus of Athens: 33, 36 n.
 76, 40 n. 93, 56 n. 153, 61
 Apollonius Dyscolus: 33, 34 n. 74,
 42 and n. 105, 55 n. 152, 57 and
 n. 160, 62
 Adverbs (GG II/I): 87-103
 119.1-4: 88 n. 4
 119.5-6: 88 n. 10
 119.5-126.24: 88 n. 5
 119.7-120.18: 88 n. 12
 120.19-121.13: 89 n. 15
 121.5-6: 89 n. 13
 121.14-122.15: 89 n. 17
 122.16-34: 89 n. 19
 123.1-125.5: 89 n. 18
 125.6-8: 90 n. 21
 125.6-126.24: 90 n. 20
 125.8-16: 91 and n. 28
 125.9: 97 n. 45

- 125.16–126.13: 90 n. 23
 125.22–126.1: 90 n. 22
 126.13–24: 91 n. 25
 126.24–145.25: 88 n. 6
 144.11–145.10: 44
 145.5–10: 43, 44
 146.1–200.32: 88 n. 7
 178.25–27: 43
 201.1–210.5: 88 n. 8
Conjunctions (GG II/I): 87 and n. 2, 93 n. 34
 222.18–19: 97 n. 45
 239.23–27: 43
Pronouns (GG II/I): 87 and n. 2, 92, 93 n. 34, 94 n. 36
 3.12–13: 43
 5.18–19: 33
 34.10–11: 97 n. 45, 101 n. 61
 42.17–25: 43
 45.12: 102 n. 62
 48.7–11: 43
 62.16–17: 41, 43
 71.20–29: 43
 109.4–5: 43
 109.20–23: 43
 113.17–115.27: 94 n. 36
 116.1–10: 92 and n. 31
 116.1–14: 94 n. 36
 116.5: 93 n. 33, 103 n. 69
 116.10: 94 n. 36
 116.10–14: 94 n. 36
Syntax (GG II/II): 87 and n. 2, 89 n. 19, 92, 101, 102
 6.4–11: 43
 13.1–15.5: 89 n. 16
 13.1–28.13: 88 n. 11
 16.12–17.15: 89 n. 14
 28.6: 89 n. 13
 51.7–12: 98 n. 51
 71.10–72.2: 44
 106.1–107.8: 43
 137.9–138.9: 43
 222.12–223.15: 43
 244.10–245.5: 43
 267.6: 102 n. 62
 267.6–268.1: 97 n. 46
 267.6–268.10: 95 n. 38, 101 n. 60
 443.7–13: 48
 Apollonius Molon: 35 n. 75
 Apollonius of Perga: 106 n. 3
 Apollonius of Rhodes: 159; see also *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Argonautica*: 151, 155
 Apollonius Sophistes: 57 n. 160
 Aratus
 Phaenomena: 92 n. 30
 Arcadius of Antioch
 On Accents
 144.7: 102 and n. 63
 Archemorus: 142
 Archilochus: 113 n. 23
 Archimedes: 125 n. 62
 Arethas: 107 n. 6
 Aristarchus of Samus: 82 n. 58
 Aristarchus of Samothrace: 1, 3, 23, 24 and nn. 28, 31, 25, 26 and nn. 38, 39, 27 and n. 42, 28 and n. 45, 30, 36 n. 76, 37, 38, 39 and nn. 87, 88, 40–44, 46, 47, 52, 55, 56 and n. 158, 57–60, 62 and n. 180, 63, 64, 76 n. 45, 92 n. 30
 fr.
 1 Matthaïos: 57 n. 161
 1–53: 58
 4: 58 n. 164
 27A: 41
 54–93: 58
 81A¹: 41 n. 97
 81A²: 41 n. 97
 81B: 41 n. 97
 92A: 40, 41
 94–95: 59
 96–135: 59
 98: 44
 99A¹: 43
 99A²: 43
 103A¹: 43, 64 n. 184

- 103A²: 43, 64 n. 184
 104B: 43
 120A: 41, 43, 64 n. 184
 123B¹: 43
 125A¹: 43, 64 n. 184
 125A²: 43, 64 n. 184
 128B: 43
 130B: 43
 133: 43
 136: 43, 44
 136-167: 59
 157C: 43
 168-178: 59
 173B: 43
 179-225: 59
 Aristocles: 51 n. 126
 Aristodemus of Nysa: 83-85
 Aristonicus: 25 n. 36, 39 n. 87, 57
 n. 160, 76-77, 79, 82 n. 58
 Aristophanes: 113, 115, 133 n. 91,
 134 n. 96, 135, 148 n. 134, 149
 n. 139, 158 n. 180, 159
 Acharnians: 153 n. 156
 Birds: 151 and n. 145
 Clouds: 134, 151 and n. 145, 154
 n. 159
 Knights: 134, 148
 41: 149 n. 139
 551: 149 n. 139
 Peace: 151 and n. 145, 154 n.
 159
 Aristophanes of Byzantium: 3, 23,
 26 and n. 38, 27 n. 41, 37, 38 n.
 82, 40, 44-52, 54, 55, 56 and n.
 158, 58 n. 162, 60 n. 171, 62 n.
 180, 82 n. 58
 fr.
 1-36 Slater: 37 n. 81
 19: 47
 22: 47
 25: 46
 26: 45
 28: 47
 155-158: 45
 162: 49
 188-190: 49
 197: 45, 49
 234: 49
 241: 46
 280-284: 45, 49
 322-324: 49
 328: 49
 344: 45
 346: 45
 347: 45 and n. 117
 369: 45
 373: 52
 374: 51
 375: 50, 52
 377: 49
 382: 48
 409: 49
 412: 49
 418: 45, 49
 Aristotle: 22 n. 25, 23 n. 26, 25,
 38, 57, 59, 60 and n. 172, 73 n.
 33
 On interpretation
 16b 6 ff.: 23
 Poetics
 §§ 20-21: 22
 1456b 20-1457b 30: 22
 1458a 18-1459a 14: 23
 Rhetoric: 23
 1404a 21: 20
 1407a 19 ff.: 23
 Topics: 131 n. 80
 Artemidorus
 The Interpretation of Dreams
 2.14: 49
 Asclepiades of Bithynia: 20 n. 17
 Asclepiades of Myrlea: 20 n. 17, 21
 n. 18, 32 n. 63, 56
 ap. Sextus Empiricus, Against the
 Learned
 1.72-73: 19
 1.74: 19
 1.91: 20
 1.252: 20
 Athena: 75, 78, 79

- Athenaeus
The Deipnosophists
 7.287a: 49
 15.680d: 81 n. 57
- Athens: 61, 112 n. 19, 115 n. 25, 132, 154
- Augustus: 65 n. 1, 67, 71, 72, 75, 78, 79, 81, 84, 85 n. 69, 86
- Ax, Wolfram: 42–44, 51–54, 55, 63
- Bacchylides: 92 n. 30, 113 n. 23
- Barwick, Karl: 28, 44
- Bastianini, Guido: 6, 153
- Beirut: 112 n. 19, 118, 128
- Bekker, Immanuel: 93
- Bembinus codex: 125–127, 135, 142 n. 121; see also Terence
- Berenice: 139
- Bible*: see *Scriptures*
- Blass, Friedrich: 9
- Bootes: 138, 139 and nn. 114, 117, 144
- Brocquet, Sylvain: 91
- Byzantium: see Constantinople
- Caesar
fr.
 11 Funaioli: 50 n. 126
- Callanan, Christopher K.: 44–52, 55
- Callimachus: 92 n. 30, 113, 130, 131 n. 80, 135 n. 101, 136, 138, 144 n. 124, 150 n. 141, 154 n. 159
- Aitia*
fr. 110.53 Pf.: 143
fr. 110.67: 138
- Hymns*
 2: 154 n. 159
 3: 154 n. 159
- Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems*
fr. 384.4 Pf.: 140
fr. 384.23–24: 141
fr. 384.25–26: 142
- Callistratus: 60 n. 171
- Carlini, Antonio: 116 n. 33
- Catullus
The Poems
 66.67: 139 n. 144
- Cavallo, Guglielmo: 93 n. 34, 117, 150, 151, 152, 161 n. 188
- Cephalenia: 72 n. 31
- Chairis
ap. Scholia Vaticana in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam
 GG I/III 118.9–11: 19
- Chares
ap. Sextus Empiricus, Against the Learned
 1.76: 19
- Charisius: 57 n. 160
The Art of Grammar
 149.26 ff.: 50
- Chrysippus: 23, 125 n. 62
fr.
 99 von Arnim: 17 n. 1
- Cicero: 123
Letters to Atticus
 16.7.3: 105
Orator
 155–162: 51 n. 131
Preliminary hearing against Caecilius: 130
- Cincius Alimentus: 65 n. 2
- Classen, Johannes: 24–25
- Claudius Didymus: 71 n. 23
- Cloatius Verus: 71
- Cobet, Carel G.: 9
- Cohn, Leopold: 74–75
- Colomo, Daniela: 8, 10, 153
- Coma: 138, 139, 143, 144

- Comanus of Naucratis: 60 n. 171
- Commentaria in Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammaticam* (GG I/III)
- Commentarius Heliodori*
95.21–23: 90 n. 22
- Scholia Vaticana*: 32 n. 64
114.22–28: 17 n. 1
124.7–14: 32
160.25–28: 33
160.28: 33
161.2–8: 32
161.6–7: 33
271.28–30: 94 n. 36
273.16–20: 99 n. 55
- Scholia Marciana*
316.24: 53 n. 136
356.21–357.26: 61 n. 177
- Scholia Londinensia*
448.12–16: 17 n. 1
454.20–21: 27 n. 44
- Constantinople: 112 n. 19, 132, 155
- Corinth: 140
- Crates of Mallus: 20, 23, 24 n. 28, 26, 28, 29 and nn. 49, 50, 52, 30 and n. 52, 40 n. 93, 53 and n. 136, 54, 82 n. 58
fr.
95 Broggiato: 53 and n. 136
101b: 53
- Crateuas: 132
- Cribiore, Raffaella: 113
- Dardanus: 67
- Demetrius Chlorus: 19
- Demetrius Gonypesus: 74, 75, 79
- Demetrius Ixion: 61
- Demetrius Triclinius: 109 n. 12
- Democritus
fr.
68 A37 D.–K.: 22 n. 23
68 B5: 22 n. 23
68 B9: 22 n. 23
68 B26: 22 n. 23
68 B125: 22 n. 23
- Demosthenes: 121 n. 49, 159 and n. 180
On the False Embassy: 154 n. 159
- Derveni Papyrus: see Papyri, *PDerveni*
- Devreesse, Robert: 133
- Di Benedetto, Vincenzo: 18, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 42, 54, 56
- Dickey, Eleanor: 102
- Didymus: 39 n. 87, 71 and nn. 23, 24, 79 n. 52
On Analogy among the Romans
fr. 1 Funaioli (= 1 Schmidt): 70 and n. 16
- Didymus the younger: 71 n. 24
- Diodorus (of Alexandria?): 82 n. 58
- Diogenes Laertius
Lives of the Philosophers
5.47.27: 32 n. 63
- Diogenes of Babylon: 23, 28, 29 nn. 48, 52, 36 n. 76, 40 n. 93, 44 and n. 111, 53, 61
fr.
22.1–5 von Arnim: 33
22.6: 33
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus
On Thucydides
37.33–34: 34 n. 71
Roman Antiquities
1.5.1: 68 n. 8
1.20.2–3: 70 n. 16
1.31.1: 69 n. 14
1.45–64: 76 n. 42
1.53.4–5: 77 n. 45
1.61.1: 67 n. 7
1.68–69: 67 n. 7
1.72.2: 67 n. 7
1.90.1: 69 n. 13
2.9.2: 68 n. 10
2.12–14: 68 n. 10
5.73.3–5.74.4: 68 n. 10

- 7.70.1-2: 68 n. 8
 7.72.1-4: 68 n. 10
 7.72.5: 68 n. 10
 7.72.8-9: 68 n. 11
 7.72.15-17: 68 n. 11
 7.72.18: 68 n. 8
 Dionysius of Sidon: 50 n. 126
 Dionysius Thrax: 18 n. 7, 20, 31
 nn. 60, 61, 32 and nn. 62, 63,
 33, 34 nn. 74, 75, 36 and n. 76,
 37 n. 79, 38, 40 nn. 91, 93, 55,
 56 and n. 153, 61
The Ars of Grammar: 24 n. 30,
 25, 28, 30-37, 38 n. 84, 39,
 40 and n. 91, 41, 42, 53, 57,
 59; see also *Commentaria in*
Dionysii Thracis Artem Gram-
maticam
 § 1: 31 n. 60, 32 n. 62
 §§ 2-4: 31 n. 60, 32 n. 62
 §§ 2-20: 31 n. 60
 § 4: 37 n. 80
 §§ 6-10: 31 n. 60
 §§ 6-20: 35 n. 74
 § 12: 35 n. 76
 GG I/I 5.1-2: 18
 GG I/I 5.1-6.3: 92 n. 30
 GG I/I 5.3-6.3: 20 n. 16
 GG I/I 6.2-3: 36 n. 76
 GG I/I 7.3-8.2: 8 and n. 17
 GG I/I 11.5-12.4: 36 n. 76
 GG I/I 23.2-3: 33
 GG I/I 33.6-34.2: 33
 GG I/I 46.4-5: 33
 GG I/I 61.1-62.5: 33
 GG I/I 63.1-69.5: 33
fr.
 54 Linke: 33
 55: 33
 Dioscorides: 131, 132
Donatiani Fragmentum
 GL VI 275.13-276.9: 51 n.
 130
 Donatus: 125, 126 and n. 65
 Egypt: 111, 112, 113 and n. 21,
 118, 128, 136, 139, 145, 153,
 154, 155
 Elias: 154
 Empedocles
 fr.
 31 B8 D.-K.: 22 n. 23
 31 B9: 22 n. 23
 Epaphroditus: 74, 75, 78, 79
 Ephyra: 140
 Eratosthenes: 18 n. 3
 ap. Scholia Vaticana in Dionysii
 Thracis Artem Grammaticam
 GG I/III 160.10-11: 17
 Erbse, Hartmut: 33, 34, 40, 41, 49,
 74-75, 157
 Euripides: 92 n. 30, 113, 151, 159
 and n. 180; see also *Scholia in Eu-*
 ripidem
 Medea: 151
 Orestes: 151
 Phoenician Women: 153 n. 156,
 154 n. 159
 Eurycleia: 82
 Eustathius
 Commentaries on Homer's Iliad
 243.14: 73, 79
 279.38-42: 46
 409.9: 69 n. 11
 436.24-25: 69 n. 11
 652.41 ff.: 49
 777.58-60: 46
 882.14: 69 n. 11
 1037.58: 69 n. 11, 74 n. 39
 1118.8: 46
 1209.10: 69 n. 11
 1327.22-23: 49
 1359.40: 69 n. 11
 Commentaries on Homer's Odyssey
 1441.18: 45 n. 117
 1625.45: 49
 1680.23 ff.: 47
 1761.30-31: 47

- 1761.38: 47
 1817.19–23: 49
 Eutocius of Ascalon: 106 n. 3, 154
 Evander: 69

 Fabius Pictor: 65–66 n. 2
 Fehling, Detlev: 30, 33, 54
 Frede, Michael: 39, 40, 54
 Friedländer, Ludwig: 25

 Galen: 12, 114 n. 25, 125 n. 62, 132
 Commentary on Hippocrates' On the Surgery
 18/2.630.12–15 Kühn: 155 n. 166
 Gaza: 112 n. 19, 118
 Gorgias
 fr.
 82 B11.49 ff. D.–K.: 22
 Gorgo: 146

 Hagen, Hermann: 124
 Haslam, Michael W.: 81–84
 Hector: 78
 Hegesianax of Alexandria Troas: 65 n. 1
 Hellanicus
 fr.
 FGrHist 4 F 84: 67 n. 7
 Hera: 75, 78
 Heracleon: 77–79
 fr.
 15 Berndt: 77
 Heraclitus
 Homeric Problems: 116 and n. 33
 Heraclitus of Ephesus: 82 n. 58
 fr.
 22 B23 D.–K.: 22 n. 23
 22 B32: 22 n. 23
 22 B48: 22 n. 23
 22 B67: 22 n. 23

 Herennius Philo
 On the Meanings of Different Words
 81 Palmieri: 45
 Herodian: 33, 34 n. 74, 39 n. 87, 42 n. 105, 57 n. 160
 On Dichrona
 GG III/II 13.14–17: 45
 On Inflection of Nouns
 GG III/II 634.5–8: 50 n. 126
 Herodotus: 159 n. 180
 Hesiod: 92 n. 30, 139; see also
 Scholia in Hesiodum fr.
 292 M.–W.: 138
 Theogony: 109 n. 12
 Works and Days: 107 n. 7, 133 n. 90, 154
 Hesychius
 κ 3739 Latte: 81 n. 57
 Hesychius of Jerusalem: 106 n. 3
 Hippocrates: 114 n. 25
 Aphorisms: 154 n. 159
 Holtz, Louis: 123
 Homer: 1, 3, 13, 24, 25 and nn. 36, 37, 26 and n. 39, 31 n. 61, 35 n. 76, 42, 43 and n. 107, 46, 47, 50, 65–86, 92 n. 30, 113, 144 n. 124, 154, 159; see also
 Scholia in Homerum, Scholia D in Homerum, Vita Homeri
 Iliad: 108, 109 n. 13, 130, 151, 152, 153, 154 n. 159, 157
 1.122: 45 n. 117
 1.533: 84
 2.382–384: 73
 13.151: 47
 13.443: 47
 15.683–684: 74, 79
 17.264: 48
 18.494–496: 68 n. 11
 18.590–594: 68 n. 11
 18.603–605: 68 n. 11
 20.306: 47

- 23.135: 47
 23.685: 68 n. 11
Odyssey
 1.107: 83
 2.14: 84
 2.46: 46
 5.168: 48
 7.88–90: 80
 14.328: 48
 14.396: 47
 14.422–429: 69 n. 11
 14.522: 47
 16.79: 47
 18.66–69: 68 n. 11
 18.74: 68 n. 11
 18.313–316: 82 n. 60
 20.105–276: 81
 20.151: 66, 82
 20.155–156: 82
 22.421–423: 82 n. 60
 Horace
Epistles
 2.1.156–157: 71 n. 25
 Horapollon: 154
 Hunt, Arthur S.: 144
Hymn to Aphrodite: 76 n. 43
 Hypsicrates: 70 n. 17
 Ildefonse, Frédérique: 56
 Isidorus
Origines
 18.39: 74 n. 36
 Isocrates: 159 n. 180
 Isthmian Games: 140, 142
 Ithaca: 83
 Iunius Filargirius (or Filagirius): 124
 and n. 61, 125, 127
 Jerome: 125 n. 62
 John Drungarios: 120 and n. 45
 John Philoponus: 154
 Johnson, John: 144
 Jones, Henry S.: 101
 Jupiter: 78
 Justin
Epitome
 31.8.1–4: 66 n. 3
 Justinian: 128, 155
Pandects: 120 n. 46
 Juvenal: 123
Satires: 135
 Kinyps: 141
 La Roche, Jacob: 25
 Lallot, Jean: 18
 Latium: 65 n. 2, 69, 77 n. 45
 Law, Vivien: 62 n. 180
 Lehrs, Karl: 25
 Lemerle, Paul: 160
 Lersch, Laurenz: 24–25
 Libya: 141
 Liddell, Henry G.: 101
 Lobel, Edgar: 136, 139
 Luschnat, Otto: 159
 Lysias: 121 n. 49
 Maehler, Herwig: 118, 153, 159
 Manfredi, Manfredo: 149
 Manuscripts
 Cambridge, University Library,
 British and Foreign Bible Society,
 213 (palimpsest): 119 n. 44
 Cambridge, University Library,
 Dd.11.70: 109 n. 12
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca
 Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 32:
 108 n. 10
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca
 Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 33:
 108 n. 10

- Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 90: 152 n. 152
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat gr. 1316: 108 n. 11
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 2193: 108 n. 10
 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3226: 125
 Cologny, Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, Bodmer 85: 108 n. 11
 Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 32.9: 109 n. 12, 151, 155, 158
 Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 69.2: 158 n. 178
 Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, 4626 = 71 Iriarte: 108 n. 10
 Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, L 116 sup.: 108 n. 11
 Modena, Biblioteca Estense, $\alpha.Q.5.20$ = gr. 87 Puntoni: 109 n. 12
 Modena, Biblioteca Estense, $\alpha.T.9.4$ = gr. 41 Puntoni: 109 n. 12
 Modena, Biblioteca Estense, $\alpha.U.9.22$ = gr. 93 Puntoni: 109 n. 12
 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. V.I.51: 108 n. 10
 Oxford, New College, 298: 108 n. 11
 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2548: 93 n. 34, 94 n. 36
 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2556: 108 n. 11
 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2713: 151 and n. 146
 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2766: 108 n. 11
 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 2771: 107 n. 7
 Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 122: 108 n. 11
 Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, gr. 6: 108 n. 10
 Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 743, olim 196: 158
 Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 765, olim 471: 151, 152
 Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 767, olim 464: 109 n. 12
 Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 822, olim 454: 107–108, 151
 Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, gr. 842, olim 474: 151, 152
 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, med. gr. 1: 131, 132 and n. 84
 Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vindob. phil. gr. 49: 109 n. 13
 Marcellinus: 114 n. 24
 Marinus: 133 n. 89
 Life of Proclus
 12: 133 n. 90
 27.11–19: 132
 Matthaïos, Stephanos: 34, 57–62, 64
 Matthews, Peter H.: 62 n. 180
 Maximus Planudes: 57 n. 160
 Maximus the Confessor: 106 n. 3
 McNamee, Kathleen: 6, 117, 122, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 143, 144, 146, 149, 150, 160
 Melicertes: 142
 Menander: 113
 Merkelbach, Reinhold: 11

- Mesatos: 7
 Mette, Hans J.: 29
 Michael Souliardos: 109 n. 12
 Minerva: 78, 79
 Montanari, Franco: 102, 153
 Mountford, James F.: 125
 Murgia, C. E.: 127 n. 68

 Nemean Games: 142
 Nicander
 Theriaka: 130
 Nicanor: 8
 Nickau, Klaus: 1, 3

 Odysseus: 67 n. 7, 80, 82 and n. 60
 Olympiodorus: 116 n. 33, 154, 158
 Olympus: 78, 79
 Orphic poems, Orpheus: 132, 133
 nn. 88, 89, 154
 Oxyrhynchus: 66, 111, 113 n. 21,
 137 n. 107, 139 n. 114, 144 n.
 124

 Panaetius of Rhodes: 61
 Paphlagon: 148, 149
 Papyri
 BKT IX 5: 134, 135 and n. 100,
 149 n. 139
 MPER N.S. I 25: 154 n. 159,
 159 n. 183
 MPER N.S. I 34: 154 n. 159
 MPER N.S. III 20: 154 n. 159
 P Acad. inv. 3d + *Bodl. Ms. Gr.*
 class. f. 72 (P): 149 n. 139
 P Amh. II 20: 154 n. 159
 P Ant. s.n. (MP³ 1487; Theocri-
 tus): 144
 P Ant. s.n. (MP³ 2925; Juvenal):
 134–135
 P Ant. I 20: 154 n. 159
 P Ant. III 153: 128
 P Berol. inv. 9872: 6
 P Berol. inv. 9875: 4
 P Berol. inv. 9917: 34 n. 71
 P Berol. inv. 10511–10512: 35 n.
 74
 P Berol. inv. 13417: 135 n. 101
 P Berol. inv. 13929: 135 n. 100
 P Berol. inv. 21105: 135 n. 100
 P Bingen 18: 148
 P Bodmer 2: 7
 P Derveni: 4, 131 n. 80
 P Fay. 3: 131 n. 80
 P Flor. II 112: 133 n. 91
 P Flor. II 115: 154 n. 159
 P Hal. inv. 55a: 34 n. 74
 P Herc. 460: 30 n. 52
 P Herc. 1073: 30 n. 52
 P Herc. 1425: 53
 P Herc. 1538: 53
 P Lille 82; 76 + 79; 78b; 78a:
 130, 131 n. 80
 P Louvre 7733: 130
 P Osl. 13: 53
 P Oxy. inv. 84/17 (a) + 84/32
 (a): 153, 154 n. 159, 157
 P Oxy. 841: 134
 P Oxy. 856: 153 n. 156
 P Oxy. 1086 (Pap. II Erbse *ad II.*
 21.785): 41
 P Oxy. 1276: 130
 P Oxy. 1371: 134, 135 and n.
 100
 P Oxy. 2161: 5–6
 P Oxy. 2221: 130
 P Oxy. 2256: 7
 P Oxy. 2258: 116 n. 31, 128 n.
 70, 129 n. 75, 136, 143 and n.
 122, 150, 157
 P Oxy. 2295: 134
 P Oxy. 2404 + P.Laur. inv.
 III/278: 7–11
 P Oxy. 2536: 123 n. 53, 133 n.
 91
 P Oxy. 3710: 66, 81–84
 P Ryl. III 477: 130
 P Ryl. III 530: 154 n. 159

- PSI I* 18: 34 and n. 74
PUniv. Milan. 309: 4
PVindob. G 29247: 154 n. 159
PWürzb. 1: 153 n. 156, 154 n. 159
TMil. Vogl. inv. 8, A, B: 35 n. 74
 Parmenides
 fr.
 28 B8.38–41 D.–K.: 22 n. 23
 28 B19: 22 n. 23
 Parmeno of Byzantium: 81–82 n. 58
 Parsons, Peter J.: 12
 Pasquali, Giorgio: 158, 159 n. 180
 Pausimachus: 30 n. 52
 Pergamum: 61
 Persius: 123
 Pertusi, Agostino: 157
 Pfeiffer, Rudolf: 1, 2, 33, 37, 38, 42, 136, 139, 144
 Philo of Alexandria
 On the Meeting for the Sake of Receiving Instruction
 146 ff.: 17 n. 1
 Philodemus
 On poems: 30 n. 52
 Philoxenus: 70–71 and n. 22, 78, 80, 81 and n. 57
 Photius
 Bibliotheca
 206 (164b 27–30 Henry): 119 n. 43
 273 (507b 17–18 Henry): 152 n. 153
 Lexicon
 μ 249.19: 49
 Pinborg, Jan: 38, 54
 Pindar: 113, 117 n. 37, 134, 159;
 see also *Scholia in Pindarum fr.*
 146 Snell: 78
 Paeans
 2.31–34: 134 n. 95
 Pythian Odes: 123 n. 53, 133 n. 91
 Plato: 57, 60, 159 n. 180; see also
 Scholia in Platonem
 Alcibiades I: 116 n. 33
 Cratylus
 399b: 22
 424c: 22
 Laws
 805e: 83 n. 64
 Phaedo: 133 n. 90
 Sophist: 22 n. 24
 261d: 22
 Theaetetus: 6, 22 n. 24
 Plotinus: 133 n. 90
 Plutarch of Athens: 133 n. 90, 154
 Plutarch of Chaeronea: 133 n. 90
 Romulus
 15: 83 n. 64
 Polemon of Ilium: 65 n. 1
 Polybius: 67 n. 6
 Pompeius: 83, 85
 Porro, Antonietta: 134, 137, 138, 139, 143
 Porphyry
 Homeric Questions: 116 and n. 33
 Poseidon: 75, 76
 Posidippus: 4
 Posidonius of Apamea: 61
 Praetextatus, L. Ateius Philologus:
 71
 Praxinoa: 146, 147
 Priam: 78
 Priscian: 32 n. 63, 57 n. 160, 94 n. 37, 101
 Institutions: 94–97
 12.580.13–15: 96 n. 42
 15.60.2–5: 97 n. 48
 15.89.14–90.4: 97 n. 47

- 17.179.25-180.10: 95 and n.
39, 101 n. 60
- Proclus: 107 n. 7, 115 n. 25, 132,
133 nn. 88-90, 134, 154
- Procopius of Gaza: 118, 119 n. 43,
120, 121 n. 49
Catena on the Canticle of Canticles:
120
1605c: 120
Catena on the Octateuch: 119, 120
PG 87 col. 21: 119 n. 42,
120, 127
- Prodicus
fr.
84 A16 D.-K.: 22
84 A17: 22
84 A19: 22
*Prolegomena Vaticana in Dionysii
Thracis Artem Grammaticam*:
see *Commentaria in Dionysii
Thracis Artem Grammaticam*,
Scholia Vaticana
- Protagoras
fr.
80 A1 D.-K.: 22
80 A27: 22
80 A29: 22
- Ps.-Hippocrates
On Nutriment: 154 n. 159
- Ptolemy the Peripatetic
*ap. Sextus Empiricus, Against the
Learned*
1.60-61: 18-19
- Quinctius Flaminius, Titus: 77 n.
45
- Quintilian: 34 n. 74, 57 n. 160, 58
Institutes of Oratory
1.4.17: 57 n. 161
- Remmius Palaemon: 44
- Rhodes: 35 n. 75, 61, 72 n. 30
- Ribbach, Willy E.: 26
- Rome: 61, 65-86
- Sapphus: 92 n. 30
- Sausage-seller: 148
- Schenkeveld, Dirk M.: 55, 56
- Schmidt, Moriz: 30
- Schneider, Richard: 96, 103
- Scholia in Aeschylum*: 109 n. 12, 156
n. 170, 157
in Oresteam: 157
in Persas: 125 n. 62
in Supplices: 157
- Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium*: 57 n.
160
- Scholia in Aristophanem*: 109 n. 12,
115, 123 n. 53
in Equites
41g: 149 n. 139
41i: 149 n. 139
551c: 150 n. 139
997c: 149 and n. 138
998a: 149 and n. 135
- Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem
Grammaticam*: see *Commentaria in
Dionysii Thracis Artem Grammati-
cam*
- Scholia in Euripidem*: 109 n. 12
in Orestem
1287: 47
- Scholia in Hesiodum*: 57 n. 160
in Opera et Dies: 157
- Scholia in Homerum*: 40, 57 n. 160,
66, 71-81, 84, 116, 117, 153
in Iliadem: 108 n. 11, 109 n. 13,
157
1.175a: 41
1.298c: 47
1.493a: 41
1.567b: 49
2.286: 41
2.384: 72, 73, 79
2.397a: 41 n. 97
2.397b-c: 41 n. 97

- 2.436a: 48
 2.592b: 41
 2.634: 72 n. 31
 3.57a: 47
 3.198a: 41
 4.331a: 41
 6.121: 46
 8.290c: 46
 9.150a: 41
 10.4b: 46
 10.349a: 46
 11.103a: 46
 11.135: 46
 11.686b: 47
 12.127–138a: 46
 12.158: 41
 12.231a: 41
 13.51a: 47
 13.443b: 47
 13.613b: 46
 14.40b: 45, 49
 14.464a: 41
 14.474a: 48
 15.301a: 46
 15.601a: 47
 15.606b: 45, 49
 15.626: 144 n. 124
 15.683–684: 74, 79
 16.123c: 41
 16.390e: 41
 17.234a: 47
 17.264b: 48
 17.721: 46
 18.526c: 46
 19.86: 48
 20.306b: 47
 20.307a¹: 75, 76, 79
 20.307–308a¹: 75, 76, 79
 20.307–308a²: 75, 76, 79
 21.577: 77, 79 and n. 50
 24.8a: 40, 41
 24.100b: 78, 79
 24.228a: 39 n. 88
 24.566d¹: 39 n. 88
in Odysseam: 58 n. 163
 2.45: 46
- 2.50: 47
 4.221: 58 n. 164
 5.168: 48
 6.74: 46
 6.264: 45, 49
 7.90: 80
 11.174: 46
 14.328: 48
 16.471: 72 n. 31
 24.208: 72 n. 31
Scholia D in Homerum: 108 n. 10
Scholia in Pindarum: 57 n. 160
Scholia in Platonem: 158, 116 n. 33
Scholia in Sophoclem: 109 n. 12
 in Aiacem: 109 n. 12
 354: 146 n. 128
 in Electram: 109 n. 12
 in Œdipum Tyrannum
 1–1111: 109 n. 12
Scholia in Theocritum: 155 n. 168
Scholia in Vergilium: 124
 Scott, Robert: 101
 Schwartz, Eduard: 158
Scriptures: 114, 116, 118, 119, 122,
 123, 131
 Sedley, David: 6
 Sextus Empiricus: 20 n. 17, 29, 34
 n. 74
 Against the Learned
 1.44: 17 n. 1, 26
 1.47: 17 n. 1
 1.52: 17 n. 1
 1.53: 17 n. 1
 1.54: 17 n. 1
 1.56: 17 n. 1
 1.57: 18, 31, 32
 1.148–154: 29 n. 49
 1.175–247: 29 n. 49
 1.197: 27 n. 44
 Sibylla: 76
 Siebenborn, Elmar: 30, 38, 39, 40,
 54

- Simplicius: 154
- Skrzeczka, Rudolph: 93, 94 and n. 36
- Smith, Ole L.: 157
- Sophocles: 7, 109 n. 12; see also
Scholia in Sophodem
- Sophokleios: 155
- Sophron
fr.
162 K.-A.: 81 n. 57
- Sosibius: 140, 141
- Steinthal, Heymann: 26-28
- Stephanus: 154
- Stephanus of Byzantium: 154-155
- Strabo: 12
- Suda*
δ 872 Adler: 71 n. 24
δ 873: 71 n. 24
δ 874: 71 n. 23
ζ 169: 121 n. 49, 154
μ 275: 49
ο 251: 84 n. 66
π 2473: 154
σ 1662: 154
τ 1115: 61 n. 177
ω 159: 154
- Suitors: 82
- Syrianus: 132, 133 and nn. 88, 89, 134, 154
- Swiggers, Pierre: 62
- Talmud*: 120 n. 46, 134 n. 92
- Tauriscus: 21 n. 18
ap. Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Learned*
1.248: 20-21
- Taylor, Daniel J.: 54, 55
- Telesilla: 147
fr.
726 III Page: 147 n. 131
- Terence: 123, 125, 126, 135, 142 n. 121; see also Bembinus codex
Phormio: 125
1-59: 126
The Andrian: 125
The Brothers: 125
The Eunuch: 125
7: 126 n. 65
50: 126 n. 65
57: 126 n. 65
78: 126 n. 65
169: 126 n. 65
The Mother-In-Law: 125
The Self-tormentor: 125
- Terra d'Otranto: 108 n. 11
- Thales: 82 n. 58
- Theocritus: 136, 144, 159; see also
Scholia in Theocritus
Idylls
15.48: 145
15.63-64: 145
- Theodosius [II?]: 154
- Theon: 123 n. 53, 133 n. 91
- Thetis: 78
- Thomas Magister: 109 n. 12
- Thrasyllus
fr.
68 A33 D.-K.: 22 n. 23
- Thucydides: 154 n. 159, 158 and n. 178, 159 and n. 180
Constitutions: 73 and n. 33
- Timaeus of Tauromenium: 65
- Timotheus
Persians: 4
- Timotheus of Gaza: 32 n. 63
- Troy, Troad: 65, 66 n. 3, 76 and n. 43, 77 n. 45, 146
- Trypho: 21 n. 20, 34 n. 74, 55 n. 152, 56, 58 n. 162, 61 and n. 177
fr.
22-27 Velsen: 62 n. 177

- 28-37: 62 n. 177
 39: 61 n. 177
 40: 61 n. 177
 62-77: 62 n. 177
 Turner, Eric G.: 11, 12
 Tyrannion: 21 n. 20, 61, 70
 fr.
 56 Haas: 21 n. 20, 61
 57: 19-20
 58: 61
 59: 21 n. 20
 Tyrannion the younger: 70
 Uhlig, Gustav: 18, 30-31, 96, 103
 Usener, Hermann: 21
 Varro: 26 n. 38, 28 n. 46, 29, 32 n.
 63, 44, 49 n. 124, 51, 52, 57 n.
 160
 fr.
 270 Funaioli: 70 and n. 16
 282.5-8: 31 n. 60
 On the Latin Language
 7.109-10.84: 29 n. 49
 8.44-84: 29 n. 52
 9.12: 51 n. 131
 10.8-10: 50 n. 126
 10.21-26: 50 n. 126
 10.42.47: 52 n. 132
 Virgil: 123 and n. 54, 127; see also
 Scholia in Vergilium
 Aeneid: 66 n. 5
 Bucolics: 124
 Vita Homeri
 6.18-23 Allen: 84 n. 66
 White, John W.: 115, 156
 Wilson, Nigel G.: 116, 117, 120,
 121, 122, 124, 125, 127, 131,
 132, 150, 152, 156, 157
 Wouters, Alfons: 62
 Xenophon
 Memorabilia
 3.9.11: 83 n. 64
 Zenodotus of Ephesus: 1, 2, 3, 4,
 13, 26 and. n. 40
 Zenodotus of Mallus: 82 n. 58
 Zephyrus: 144
 Zetzl, James: 125, 126
 Zeus: 75, 78
 Zosimus of Ascalon: 121 n. 49, 154
 and n. 161
 Zosimus of Gaza: 121 n. 49, 154
 and n. 161
 Zuntz, Günther: 116, 117, 118,
 120, 121, 122, 150, 151, 152,
 156

List of contributors

Franco Montanari is Full Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Genoa (franco.montanari@unige.it)

Lara Pagani (PhD in Classics) is Research Fellow at the University of Genoa (lara.pagani@unige.it)

Paola Ascheri (PhD in Classics) is Research Fellow at the University of Genoa (paolascheri@libero.it)

Silvia Consonni has a degree in Classics at the „Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore“ in Milan (consonni.silvia@gmail.com)

Fausto Montana is Full Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Pavia, Faculty of Musicology in Cremona (fausto.montana@unipv.it)

